
V. I. L E N I N

COLLECTED WORKS

VOLUME

29

March–August 1919

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
M O S C O W

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN
EDITED BY G E O R G E H A N N A

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Preface	15
<i>March-August 1919</i>	
SESSION OF THE PETROGRAD SOVIET. MARCH 12, 1919	19
1. REPORT ON THE FOREIGN AND HOME POLICY OF THE COUNCIL OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARS. <i>Brief Newspaper Report</i>	19
2. REPLIES TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS	26
SESSION OF THE FIRST CONGRESS OF FARM LABOURERS OF PETROGRAD GUBERNIA. MARCH 13, 1919	38
1. SPEECH ON THE ORGANISATION OF A FARM LABOURERS' UNION	38
2. REPLIES TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS	43
SPEECH DELIVERED AT A MEETING IN THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE, PETROGRAD. MARCH 13, 1919. <i>Newspaper Report</i>	47
THE ACHIEVEMENTS AND DIFFICULTIES OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT	55
Afterword	87
SPEECH IN MEMORY OF Y. M. SVERDLOV AT A SPECIAL SESSION OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. MARCH 18, 1919	89
SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE FUNERAL OF YAKOV SVERDLOV. MARCH 18, 1919. <i>Newspaper Report</i>	95
DRAFT PROGRAMME OF THE R.C.P.(B.)	97

1. Rough Draft of the Programme of the R.C.P.	99
The Basic Tasks of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in Russia	105
2. Draft Programme of the R.C.P. (Bolsheviks)	119
3. Insertion for Political Section of the Programme . .	125
4. Fragment of the Political Section of the Programme	126
5. Section of the Programme on National Relations . .	127
6. Insertion for the Final Draft of the Programme Section on the National Question	128
7. Preamble to the Military Section of the Programme	129
8. First Paragraph of Section of the Programme on the Courts	131
9. Section of the Programme Dealing with Public Edu- cation	132
10. Section of the Programme Dealing with Religion	134
11. Points from the Economic Section of the Programme	135
12. Agrarian Section of the Programme	139
<i>EIGHTH CONGRESS OF THE R.C.P.(B.), March 18-23 1919 . .</i>	<i>141</i>
1. SPEECH OPENING THE CONGRESS. MARCH 18	143
2. REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE. MARCH 18	146
3. REPORT ON THE PARTY PROGRAMME. MARCH 19	165
4. SPEECH CLOSING THE DEBATE ON THE PARTY PRO- GRAMME. MARCH 19	186
5. WIRELESS MESSAGE OF GREETING ON BEHALF OF THE CONGRESS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE HUNGARIAN SOVIET REPUBLIC. MARCH 22	197
6. REPORT ON WORK IN THE COUNTRYSIDE. MARCH 23 . .	198
7. SPEECH IN OPPOSITION TO A MOTION TO CLOSE THE DE- BATE ON THE REPORT ON WORK IN THE COUNTRYSIDE MARCH 23	216
8. RESOLUTION ON THE ATTITUDE TO THE MIDDLE PEASANTS	217
9. SPEECH CLOSING THE CONGRESS. MARCH 23	221
WIRELESS MESSAGE OF GREETING TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE HUNGARIAN SOVIET REPUBLIC. MARCH 22, 1919	226

RECORD OF WIRELESS MESSAGE TO BÉLA KUN MARCH 23, 1919	227
REPLY TO AN OPEN LETTER BY A BOURGEOIS SPECIALIST	228
ON THE CANDIDACY OF M. I. KALININ FOR THE POST OF CHAIRMAN OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. <i>Speech at the Twelfth Session of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee. March 30, 1919</i>	233
SPEECHES ON GRAMOPHONE RECORDS	237
1. IN MEMORY OF COMRADE YAKOV MIKHAILOVICH SVERDLOV, CHAIRMAN OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE	239
2. THE THIRD, COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL	240
3. COMMUNICATION ON THE WIRELESS NEGOTIATIONS WITH BÉLA KUN	242
4. AN APPEAL TO THE RED ARMY	244
5. THE MIDDLE PEASANTS	246
6. WHAT IS SOVIET POWER?	248
7. HOW THE WORKING PEOPLE CAN BE SAVED FROM THE OPPRESSION OF THE LANDOWNERS AND CAPITALISTS FOR EVER	250
8. ANTI-JEWISH POGROMS	253
TELEPHONE MESSAGE TO THE ALL-RUSSIA EXTRAORDINARY COMMISSION APRIL 1, 1919	254
EXTRAORDINARY PLENARY MEETING OF THE MOSCOW SOVIET OF WORKERS' AND RED ARMY DEPUTIES <i>April 3, 1919</i>	255
1. REPORT ON THE DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN SITUATION OF THE SOVIET REPUBLIC	255
2. RESOLUTION ON THE REPORT ON THE DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN SITUATION OF THE SOVIET REPUBLIC	272
LETTER TO THE PETROGRAD WORKERS ON AID FOR THE EASTERN FRONT	275
THESES OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS) ON THE SITUATION ON THE EASTERN FRONT	276
PLENARY MEETING OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL COUNCIL OF TRADE UNIONS. <i>April 11, 1919</i>	280
1. REPORT ON THE TASKS OF THE TRADE UNIONS IN THE MOBILISATION FOR THE EASTERN FRONT	283
2. REPLY TO A QUESTION ON THE TULA STRIKE	296

3. SPEECH CLOSING THE DISCUSSION	298
FOREWORD TO HENRI GUILBEAUX'S PAMPHLET <i>SOCIALISM AND SYNDICALISM IN FRANCE DURING THE WAR</i>	302
SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE FIRST MOSCOW SOVIET COMMANDERS' COURSES. APRIL 15, 1919. <i>Brief Newspaper Report</i>	304
THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AND ITS PLACE IN HISTORY	305
SPEECH AT A MEETING OF THE RAILWAYMEN OF MOSCOW JUNCTION. APRIL 16, 1919	314
THE FIGHT AGAINST KOLCHAK. SPEECH AT A CONFERENCE OF MOSCOW FACTORY COMMITTEES AND TRADE UNIONS. APRIL 17, 1919. <i>Newspaper Report</i>	320
SPEECH AT THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF COMMUNIST STUDENTS, APRIL 17, 1919	324
MESSAGE OF GREETINGS TO THE BAVARIAN SOVIET REPUBLIC	325
TELEGRAM TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARS OF THE UKRAINE	327
THREE SPEECHES DELIVERED IN RED SQUARE. MAY 1, 1919. <i>Newspaper Reports</i>	328
1.	328
2.	330
3. Speech at the Unveiling of a Monument to Stepan Razin on Lobnoye Mesto	331
FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS ON ADULT EDUCATION. May 6-19, 1919	333
1. SPEECH OF GREETING. MAY 6	335
2. DECEPTION OF THE PEOPLE WITH SLOGANS OF FREEDOM AND EQUALITY. MAY 19	339
I	340
II	345
III	350
IV	357
V	370
FOREWORD TO THE PUBLISHED SPEECH "DECEPTION OF THE PEOPLE WITH SLOGANS OF FREEDOM AND EQUALITY"	377
TELEGRAM TO THE COUNCIL OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARS OF THE UKRAINE	382

ADDENDUM TO THE DRAFT APPEAL TO GERMAN WORKERS AND TO PEASANTS WHO DO NOT EXPLOIT THE LABOUR OF OTHERS	383
TELEGRAM TO J. V. STALIN. <i>May 20, 1919</i>	385
SPEECH AT THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING FESTIVAL MAY 25, 1919. <i>Brief Newspaper Report</i>	386
GREETINGS TO THE HUNGARIAN WORKERS	387
THE HEROES OF THE BERNE INTERNATIONAL	392
TELEGRAM TO J. V. STALIN. <i>May 29, 1919</i>	402
BEWARE OF SPIES!	403
DRAFT C.C. DIRECTIVES ON ARMY UNITY	404
TELEGRAM TO J. V. STALIN. <i>June 4, 1919</i>	406
DRAFT DECISION OF THE C.C. R.C.P.(B.) ON THE PETROGRAD FRONT	407
A GREAT BEGINNING. <i>Heroism of the Workers in the Rear.</i> <i>"Communist Subbotniks"</i>	409
TELEGRAM TO J. V. STALIN. <i>June 30, 1919</i>	435
ALL OUT FOR THE FIGHT AGAINST DENIKIN! <i>Letter of the Cen-</i> <i>tral Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks)</i> <i>to Party Organisations</i>	436
Main Task of the Moment	437
The Truth About Kolchak and Denikin Must Be Explained to the People	438
Work Among Men Called Up for Service	439
Work Among the Deserters	440
Direct Aid to the Army	441
Curtailment of Work Not for the War	442
Work in the Front Zone	445
Attitude Towards Military Experts	447
The Fight Against Counter-revolution in the Rear	450
The Population Must Be Mobilised for War to a Man . .	453
"Work in a Revolutionary Way"	454

THE PRESENT SITUATION AND THE IMMEDIATE TASKS OF SOVIET POWER. <i>Report Delivered to a Joint Meeting of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, the Moscow Soviet of Workers' and Red Army Deputies, the All-Russia Council of Trade Unions and Representatives of Moscow Factory Committees, July 4, 1919</i>	456
THE STATE. <i>A Lecture Delivered at the Sverdlov University July 11, 1919</i>	470
THE DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN SITUATION OF THE REPUBLIC. REPORT DELIVERED TO THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE OF THE R.C.P.(B.) JULY 12, 1919. <i>Newspaper Report</i>	489
THE TASKS OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL. <i>Ramsay Mac Donald on the Third International</i>	494
I	497
II	498
III	500
IV	503
V	506
VI	509
SPEECH ON THE DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN SITUATION DELIVERED TO A RED ARMY CONFERENCE HELD IN KHODYNSKOYE CAMP. JULY 15, 1919. <i>Brief Newspaper Report</i>	513
ANSWERS TO AN AMERICAN JOURNALIST'S QUESTIONS	515
THE FOOD AND WAR SITUATION. SPEECH AT A MOSCOW CONFERENCE OF FACTORY COMMITTEES, TRADE UNIONS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MOSCOW CENTRAL WORKERS' CO-OPERATIVE. JULY 30, 1919	520
SPEECH AT THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF WORKERS IN EDUCATION AND SOCIALIST CULTURE JULY 31, 1919	532
IN THE SERVANTS' QUARTERS	540
I	540
II	542
SPEECH AT A NON-PARTY CONFERENCE OF WORKERS AND MEN OF THE RED ARMY AUGUST 6, 1919. <i>Newspaper Report</i>	547
First Version	547
Second Version	549
TO COMRADES SERRATI AND LAZZARI	551

LETTER TO THE WORKERS AND PEASANTS APROPOS OF THE VICTORY OVER KOLCHAK	552
LETTER TO SYLVIA PANKHURST	561
FREEDOM TO TRADE IN GRAIN	567
The Basic Condition for Victory	567
The True Road to Victory	568
What Is Freedom to Trade in Grain?	570
<i>Notes</i>	571
<i>The Life and Work of V. I. Lenin. Outstanding Dates</i>	589

ILLUSTRATIONS

First page of Lenin's manuscript "Agrarian Section of the Programme". 1919	138-39
First page of Lenin's manuscript "A Great Beginning" June 28, 1919	410-11

PREFACE

Volume Twenty-Nine covers the period from March to August 1919. The material for the "Draft Programme of the R.C.P.(B.)" was written in February and March 1919; it has been placed before the documents of the Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) with which it is directly connected.

The volume consists mainly of reports and speeches delivered at congresses, conferences and meetings. They reflect Lenin's activity as a statesman and deal with major issues of the policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government in that period—the defence of the socialist country, the attitude towards the middle peasants and the combating of economic difficulties.

The reports and speeches at the Eighth Congress of the R.C.P.(B.) make up a large section of the volume; they include the report of the Central Committee, the report on the Party Programme and the speech closing the debate on the Programme and the report on work in the countryside.

A number of items—the "Report on the Domestic and Foreign Situation of the Soviet Republic" delivered to the Extraordinary Plenary Meeting of the Moscow Soviet on April 3, 1919, the "Letter to the Petrograd Workers on Aid for the Eastern Front", "Theses of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) on the Situation on the Eastern Front", "Report on the Tasks of the Trade Unions in the Mobilisation for the Eastern Front" delivered to a Plenary Meeting of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions on April 11, 1919, speech on "The Fight Against Kolchak" at a Conference of Moscow Factory Committees and Trade Unions on April 17, 1919, and

others—are devoted to the mobilisation of the working class and the working people as a whole to fight Kolchak.

In his "Letter to the Workers and Peasants Apropos of the Victory over Kolchak" Lenin formulates the main tasks of strengthening the defence potential of the Soviet Republic as suggested by the experience of the victorious struggle against Kolchak.

In his report "The Present Situation and the Immediate Tasks of Soviet Power" delivered to a joint meeting of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, the Moscow Soviet of Workers' and Red Army Deputies, the All-Russia Council of Trade Unions, and representatives of Moscow factory committees on July 4, 1919, "Report on the Domestic and Foreign Situation of the Republic" delivered to the Moscow Conference of the R.C.P.(B.) on July 12, 1919, the speech on "The Food and War Situation" at the Moscow Conference of Factory Committees, Trade Unions and representatives of the Moscow Central Workers' Co-operative delivered on July 30, 1919, and others, Lenin calls on the people to muster their forces for the struggle against Denikin. In these, as in other speeches in this volume, Lenin explains the principles of the Soviet food policy and outlines measures to improve the food situation in the country.

In "The Third International and Its Place in History", "The Tasks of the Third International" and other articles, Lenin shows the epoch-making significance of the Communist International and defines its tasks.

In the speech on the "Deception of the People with Slogans of Freedom and Equality" delivered at the First All-Russia Congress on Adult Education on May 19, 1919, and the "Speech at the First All-Russia Congress of Workers in Education and Socialist Culture" delivered on July 31, 1919, Lenin develops the Marxist theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat and shows the contrast between proletarian and bourgeois democracy.

Lenin's lecture on "The State", delivered at the Sverdlov Communist University, explains the fundamentals of the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the state, its origin, nature and historical forms.

The volume includes Lenin's well-known pamphlet *A Great Beginning* in which he appraises the role of the early

communist subbotniks and shows the decisive importance of high labour productivity to the victory of communism.

In this volume there are fifteen new documents that had not previously been published in a Russian edition of the *Collected Works*. In his "Replies to Written Questions" handed up at a meeting of the Petrograd Soviet on March 12, 1919, Lenin speaks of the work of the Council of People's Commissars. Among writings published for the first time are "Draft C.C. Directives on Army Unity", "Draft Decision of the C.C. R.C.P.(B.) on the Petrograd Front" and a telegram to the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukraine. These documents reflect Lenin's work to strengthen the Soviet state and its defence.

In the appeal "Beware of Spies!" Lenin proposes greater revolutionary vigilance to combat counter-revolution.

The C.C. R.C.P.(B.) letter "All Out for the Fight Against Denikin!" sets the task of reforming all public offices on military lines and transforming the country into a single military camp to organise the victory over Denikin.

The "Addendum to the Draft Appeal to German Workers and to Peasants Who Do Not Exploit the Labour of Others" points out the growing sympathy for the Soviet state on the part of working people all over the world, and describes the leaders of the Second International as traitors to socialism and accomplices in the crimes of the bourgeoisie.

A telegram to the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukraine (end of April 1919) was not included in earlier Russian editions.

Some new documents have been included under the heading "Draft Programme of the R.C.P.(B.)"—the "Rough Draft of the Programme of the R.C.P.", published according to typewritten and manuscript copies, which covers all sections of the programme; the section on "The Basic Tasks of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in Russia" was first printed in full in the Fourth Russian edition. The volume also includes the "Insertion for the Final Draft of the Programme Section on the National Question" and the "Draft Programme of the R.C.P. (Bolsheviks)" which is made up of the first sections of the draft Programme as subsequently edited by Lenin.

SESSION OF THE PETROGRAD SOVIET MARCH 12, 1919

1

REPORT ON THE FOREIGN AND HOME POLICY OF THE COUNCIL OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARS

BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

(Lenin's appearance on the platform is greeted by a lengthy ovation. All rise.)

"This hall reminds me of the first time I spoke at a meeting of the Petrograd Soviet, when the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries still ruled it. We have forgotten the recent past too soon, but today, the way the revolution is developing in other countries reminds us of what we experienced not so long ago. Formerly it was assumed that in the West, where class antagonisms are much more developed, because of the more intensive development of capitalism, the revolution would proceed on lines differing somewhat from those of this country, and that power would pass directly from the bourgeoisie to the proletariat. Events in Germany, however, indicate the contrary. The German bourgeoisie have united to counteract the masses of the proletariat who have raised their heads; they acquire strength from the greater experience gained by the Western bourgeoisie, and are waging a systematic struggle against the proletariat. The German revolutionary masses, however, still lack experience, and can gain it only in the course of this struggle. Everybody remembers the revolution of 1905, when the Russian proletariat entered the struggle without any previous experience. In the present revolution, however, we have taken into account and made use of the experience we gained in the revolution of 1905."

Lenin then proceeded to review the work of the Council of People's Commissars. He recalled the first period of the

revolution when the masses did not yet know what to do and still lacked sufficiently authoritative and powerful guiding centres.

"We knew perfectly well," Lenin continued, "that to achieve success in the struggle that had been started the greatest possible cohesion of the exploited masses and all elements of the entire working population was essential, and this inevitably brought us face to face with the question of forms of organisation. We remembered very well the part the Soviets had played in 1905, and revived them as the most suitable means of uniting the working people in their struggle against the exploiters. Before the revolution in Germany we always said that the Soviets were the most suitable organs of government for Russia. At that time we could not say that they were equally suitable for the West, but events have shown that they are. We see that Soviets are gaining popularity in the West, and that the fight for them is going on not only in Europe, but also in America. Soviet-type councils are being set up everywhere, and sooner or later they will take power into their own hands.

"The present situation in America, where such councils are being set up, is extremely interesting. Perhaps the movement there will not develop as it is developing in this country, but the important thing is that there, too, the Soviet form of organisation has gained extensive popularity. This form has superseded all other forms of proletarian organisation. The anarchists were formerly opposed to all government but after they had got to know the Soviet form they accepted it, and thereby demolished the whole theory of anarchism, which repudiates every form of government. Two years ago the compromising idea of collaboration with the bourgeoisie was dominant in our Soviets. A certain amount of time was required to clear the minds of the masses of the old rubbish that prevented them from understanding what was going on. This could be achieved only when the Soviets had undertaken the practical work of building the state. The masses of the workers in Germany are now in the same position, and their minds, too, must be cleared of the same old rubbish, although in that country the process is more intense, cruel and bloody than in Russia.

"I have digressed somewhat from the subject on which the Presidium of the Petrograd Soviet has asked me to speak, but this could not be helped.

"The activities of the Council of People's Commissars during the past year can be understood only by appraising the role of the Soviets in the light of the world revolution. Often the minor daily affairs of administration and the inevitable petty problems of the work of organisation distract our attention and make us forget the great cause of the world revolution. But only by gauging the role of the Soviets on a world scale can we properly understand the minor details of the internal life of our country, and regulate them in proper time. The bigwig inspectors from Berne¹ say that we advocate violence, but they deliberately shut their eyes to the practices of their own bourgeoisie which governs exclusively with the aid of violence.

"Before we adopted the Soviet form of government there was a period of several months during which the masses prepared themselves for this new, hitherto unprecedented form of government. We tore the Kerensky government to shreds; we compelled the Provisional Government to keep on changing its Cabinet, to jump from right to left, up and down, and this definitely proved to the masses that the clique of compromisers with bourgeoisie who claimed the right to power at that time were unfit to govern the country, and only after this did we take power into our hands.

"The matter is much more complicated when taken on a world scale. In that case, revolutionary violence is not enough; revolutionary violence must be preceded by a period of preparation, like the one we passed through, but of somewhat longer duration, of course. At one time the Treaty of Brest² was a vexed question, and certain gentlemen called it a compromise and decided to take advantage of this step of the Soviet government to serve their demagogic aims. But if this is called a compromise, it would also be correct to say that we compromised with the tsar when we went into the State Duma in order to disrupt it from within. We concluded the Treaty of Brest because we expected the development of conditions in Germany that would bring about the overthrow of Wilhelm, and this shows how correct our calculations were.

"In the Entente³ countries we see the awakening of the masses which the governments of these countries are doing their utmost to prevent. For this purpose the thoughts of the as yet politically unenlightened masses are being diverted to 'patriotic' channels. The masses are being lured by promises of the advantages of a victorious peace, they are being promised incalculable blessings when peace is concluded. They are being sustained with illusions. But the extent to which these illusions are likely to become reality may be gauged by the conversation I had recently with an American, a shrewd and level-headed businessman, whose interests differ entirely from ours. He described the situation in France as follows. The French Government is promising the masses piles of gold which, it claims, will be obtained from the Germans but the Germans have to have something to pay with, for if a debtor has nothing, nothing can be got from him and all the illusions based on the prospect of concluding an advantageous peace with Germany will be dispelled, for the peace that has been concluded will be a bankrupt peace. Even the enemies of the revolution realise this, for they see no way out of the present situation except the overthrow of capitalism. In this respect the temper of the Paris crowds, which are extremely sensitive and responsive, is typical. Six months ago people were quite tolerant towards speakers at meetings who roundly abused the Bolsheviks. But now, if any speaker dares to say anything against the Bolsheviks, they refuse to give him a hearing. The bourgeoisie have helped us a great deal to popularise our ideas. Their attacks on us made the masses think and discuss and, as a consequence, those of the masses of Paris who are able to think for themselves have come to the conclusion that since the bourgeoisie detest the Bolsheviks so much the Bolsheviks must know how to fight them. The Entente has now turned its attention to us and wants to pay the bills it owes out of our pocket. We have to reckon with a powerful enemy whose military strength is superior to ours, but not for long. Disillusionment with the victory is bound to set in, and this will lead to the collapse of all the 'Allied' machinations, that is, if they do not quarrel with each other before that. All countries are now suffering from hunger and no victory will help overcome it. We are confronted with complicated problems of foreign

policy. In this respect we have the experience of the Brest peace, the most important step in the foreign policy of the Council of People's Commissars. The Brest peace was concluded with a powerful enemy who was far superior to us in military strength, and this caused disagreement even in our own ranks, but the proletarian state had to take such a first step because it was surrounded on all sides by imperialist predators. The Brest peace sapped the strength of our powerful enemy. In a very short time the Germany which had forced these predatory terms upon us collapsed, and the same fate awaits the other countries, the more so that everywhere we see the armies falling to pieces.

"We must recall the time when the disintegration of our army was ascribed to the impatience of the Russians, but this seems to be the lot of all countries that take the path of revolution. The downright robbery now being perpetrated by the 'democratic' governments in Paris is opening the eyes of the masses, the more so that their bickering over the spoils, which at times grows into a serious quarrel, is no longer a secret.⁴ Unfavourable though the conditions under which Soviet Russia exists may be, we have this one advantage, which even the bourgeois *Times* lays stress upon. In an article written by its military expert it spoke of the growing disintegration of the armies of all countries except Russia. According to the *Times*, Russia is the only country in which the army is not falling to pieces but is being built up. This has been one of the most important features of our development during the past year. We are surrounded by enemies, we are defending ourselves and fighting to regain every inch of Soviet Russia's territory, and every month of struggle brings us nearer and nearer to the world revolution. We were the first in the world to take power, and today Soviets of working people govern our country. Shall we succeed in retaining power? If we do not, it will prove that historically we were not justified in seizing power. But today we can be justly proud of having withstood this test and of having upheld the power of the working people in spite of the incalculable suffering we have been compelled to undergo."

Lenin then went on to deal with the question of the specialists.

Some of our comrades, he said, express indignation at the fact that former officers and others who served the tsar are at the head of the Red Army. "Naturally, in organising the Red Army this question acquires special significance and success in this work depends on its correct presentation. But the question of specialists must be discussed on a broader scale. We must make use of them in all spheres of organisation, wherever we, lacking the experience and scientific training of the old bourgeois specialists, are ourselves naturally unable to cope with our tasks. We are not utopians who think that socialist Russia must be built up by men of a new type; we must utilise the material we have inherited from the old capitalist world. We are placing people of the old type in new conditions, keeping them under proper control, under the vigilant supervision of the proletariat, and making them do the work we need. This is the only way we can build. If you are unable to erect the edifice with the materials bequeathed to us by the bourgeois world, you will not be able to build it at all, and you will not be Communists, but mere phrase-mongers. For the purpose of building socialism, we must make the fullest use of the science, technology and, in general, everything that capitalist Russia bequeathed to us. Of course there will be great difficulties in our way. Mistakes are inevitable. There are deserters and deliberate saboteurs everywhere. Against these, force had to be the primary weapon. But after that we must make use of the moral weight of the proletariat, strong organisation and discipline. There is no need whatever to reject useful specialists, but they must be kept within definite limits so that the proletariat can keep them under control. They must be entrusted with certain work, but a vigilant eye must also be kept on them, commissars must be placed over them to thwart their counter-revolutionary scheming. At the same time we must also learn from them. Above all, no political concessions whatever must be made to these gentlemen whose services we are using wherever possible. We have already succeeded in doing this to some extent. We have passed from the stage of suppressing the capitalists to the stage of using their services, and this, perhaps, is one of the most important achievements in the field of internal development during the past year.

"One of the most serious problems affecting our cultural development is that of the rural districts. Soviet power presupposes the widest possible support of the working people. This sums up our entire rural policy during this period. It was necessary to link up the urban proletariat with the rural poor, and this we have done. Today they are most intimately connected by thousands of imperceptible threads. Here, as elsewhere, we encounter considerable difficulties, for the peasants are accustomed to feel that they are independent proprietors. They are accustomed to sell their grain freely, and every peasant regarded this as his inalienable right. Now a tremendous effort is needed to convince them definitely that only by means of the communist organisation of production shall we be able to cope with the devastation caused by the war. This must be done by persuasion and not by force. Of course, among the peasants too we have open enemies, the kulaks; but the bulk of the poor peasants, and of the middle peasants who are close to them, are on our side. Against the kulaks, who are our inveterate enemies, we have but one weapon—force. When we began to carry out our food policy on the principle that the peasants must surrender their surplus stocks for the benefit of the famine-stricken, some people began to shout to the peasants: 'They're robbing you!' These were the inveterate enemies of, the peasants, workers and communism, enemies arrayed in Menshevik, Left Socialist-Revolutionary, or other clownish costumes, and these we shall continue to treat in the same way as we have treated them up to now."

2

REPLIES TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Comrades, I now want to reply to the written questions, two of which are not quite clear. However, one of them appears to contain two main ideas. In the first place, its author has a grudge against the Bolsheviks who went at things with a rush, and sympathises with the Mensheviks because of their love of the gradual. Secondly, he asks about peasant revolts.

Insofar as concerns the first question, let me say that if you make this sort of accusation against the Bolsheviks you must say what they did in a rush, and what is good about gradualness. The main thing that distinguishes us from the Mensheviks was our insistence on the transfer of all power to the Soviets and we rushed things to such an extent that in October of the year before last we took power. The Mensheviks advocated procrastination since they did not desire that transfer of power. The well-known socialist Kautsky, for instance, a man who sympathises with the Mensheviks, said in a pamphlet in August 1918 that the Bolsheviks should not take power because they would not be able to hold out, that they would perish and in that way destroy a whole party. I think that view has been disproved by the course of events and that it is not worth while wasting time on it, especially as there have not been any clear objections. In Germany, Kautsky insisted on democracy, on a Constituent Assembly. The German Mensheviks and ours said that power should not be given to the Soviets. The Constituent Assembly assembled in Germany, and in January and March there were several huge workers' revolts, a civil war, the result of which was that the German Mensheviks, headed by Hilferding, proposed in recent articles to combine the Constituent Assembly with Workers' Councils in such a way as to give the Central Committee of the Councils the right to hold up

decisions made by the Constituent Assembly and submit questions to a plebiscite. This shows that the German Mensheviks, even the best of them, are in an absolute muddle. The idea of combining the Constituent Assembly and the Workers' Councils, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat, deserves nothing but ridicule.

With regard to the peasant revolts—there is a question on that subject here. We have, of course, experienced a number of kulak revolts and they are still occurring. Last summer there was a whole string of them. The kulak is our implacable enemy. And here we can hope for nothing unless we crush him. The middle peasant is a different case, he is not our enemy. It is not true that there have been peasant revolts in Russia that involved a large number of peasants who were not kulaks. An individual village or a volost does join the kulaks, but under Soviet power there have been no peasant revolts that involved all the peasants in Russia. There have been kulak revolts and there will be more under a government that insists on surplus grain being sold to the hungry at fixed prices. Such revolts are inevitable because the kulak who has a big stock of grain can sell it at several hundred rubles a pood; we all know what prices the food profiteers are getting. If we allow the kulaks so much freedom, the rich man who has a secret cache of Kerensky paper money⁵ will fill his belly, but the majority who have nothing hidden will go hungry. And so we do not close our eyes to the inevitability of kulak revolts against Soviet power. When the capitalists were in power workers' revolts against them and peasant revolts against the landowners were inevitable. Now that the landowners and capitalists have been smashed kulak revolts will occur less and less frequently. You have to take your choice. If there is anyone who wants everything to go smoothly without any revolts, who wants the rich people to hand us a declaration of love on a salver and promise to hand over all surpluses peacefully, I don't think we can take him seriously.

The other unclear note contains the following. What is to be done when workers, misled by the appeals of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, do not work, go on strike, and come out against Soviet power because of the food shortage? I cannot, of course, count on all workers, down to the last, supporting

Soviet power. When the Paris workers revolted in 1871, quite a large number of workers in other towns fought against them in the whiteguard troops and crushed the Paris workers. That did not prevent politically-conscious socialists from asserting that the Paris Communards represented the entire proletariat, that is, all that was best and honest—only backward sections of the workers served in the whiteguard troops. We, too, have backward workers who are not politically conscious and who have not yet understood Soviet power; we are doing our best to enlighten them. No other government has satisfied the demands for standing representative bodies of workers to the extent the Soviets have, which are willing to give any representative of a factory a place in a government institution. We are, as far as possible, drawing workers into the implementation of the policy of the state; under capitalism, even in republics, the workers were kept out of it but Soviet power does its best to attract workers, although some of them will feel the attraction of the old for quite a long time to come.

There are very few people among you, probably only an individual or two, who remember serfdom; only very old people can remember that, but there are people who remember what things were like thirty or forty years ago. Anyone who was in the rural districts knows that some thirty years ago there were quite a number of old people in the villages who said, "It was better under serfdom, there was more order, things were strict and the women did not dress extravagantly." If you now read Gleb Uspensky—we are erecting a monument to him as one of the best writers about peasant life—you will find descriptions dating back to the eighties and nineties of honest old peasants and sometimes just ordinary elderly people who said frankly that it had been better under serfdom. When an old social order is destroyed it cannot be destroyed immediately in the minds of all people, there will always be some who are drawn to the old.

Some workers, printers, for instance, say that capitalism was good, there were a lot of newspapers whereas now there are few, in those days they earned a decent wage and they do not want any socialism. There were quite a number of branches of industry that depended on the rich classes or on the production of articles of luxury. Under capitalism quite

a number of workers in big cities lived by producing articles of luxury. In the Soviet Republic we shall have to leave these workers unemployed for a time. We shall say to them, "Get down to some other, useful work." And the worker will say, "I did delicate work, I was a jeweller, it was clean work, I worked for gentlemen; now the muzhik is in power, the gentlemen have been scattered and I want to go back to capitalism." Such people will preach going back to capitalism, or, as the Mensheviks say, going forward to healthy capitalism and sound democracy. A few hundred workers are to be found who will say, "We lived well under a healthy capitalism." The people who lived well under capitalism were an insignificant minority—we defend the interests of the majority that lived badly under capitalism. (*Applause.*) Healthy capitalism led to world slaughter in the countries with the greatest freedom. There can be no healthy capitalism, there can be capitalism of the sort obtaining in the freest republic, one like the American republic, cultured, rich, technically developed; and that democratic and most republican capitalism, led to the most savage world slaughter over the plunder of the whole world. Out of fifteen million workers you will find a few thousand who lived well under capitalism. In the rich countries there are more such workers because they work for a greater number of millionaires and multimillionaires. They served that handful and received particularly high wages from them. Take hundreds of British millionaires—they have accumulated thousands of millions because they have plundered India and a large number of colonies. It meant nothing to them to make gifts to 10,000 or 20,000 workers, giving them double or higher wages so that they would work well for them. I once read the reminiscences of an American barber whom a multimillionaire paid a dollar a day to shave him. And that barber wrote a whole book praising that multimillionaire and his own wonderful life. For a daily visit of one hour to his financial majesty he received a dollar, was satisfied and did not want anything but capitalism. We have to be on our guard against such an argument. The vast majority of workers were not in such a position. We, the Communists of the whole world, defend the interests of the vast majority of working people, and it was a small minority of working people whom the capitalists bribed with high

wages and made them the loyal servants of capital. Under serfdom there were people, peasants, who said to the landowners, "We are your slaves (that was after emancipation), we shall not leave you." Were there many of them? An insignificant few. Can you deny that there was a struggle against serfdom by reference to them? Of course not. And today communism cannot be denied by reference to the minority of workers who earned good money on bourgeois newspapers, on the production of articles of luxury and for their personal services to multimillionaires.

I shall now deal with the questions that were presented clearly, first of all with the question of concessions in general and of the Great Northern Railway⁶ in particular. It is said that it would be allowing predators to plunder the wealth of the nation. In answer to this I say that the question is closely connected with bourgeois specialists and the question of world imperialism. Can we smash world imperialism today? It would be our duty to do it if we could, but you know that we cannot do it today any more than we could have overthrown Kerensky in March 1917; we had to wait for the Soviet organisations to develop, we had to work for that and not revolt against Kerensky immediately. And today, is an offensive war against world imperialism any more possible? Of course not. If we had been strong enough, if we could have obtained a lot of grain quickly, and had machinery and so on, we would not have allowed the Scheidemanns to mow down the Spartacists⁷ but would have kicked them out. Today, however, that is misplaced fantasy, today our country alone cannot overthrow world imperialism; other countries are experiencing a period in which there is no Soviet majority and in many countries Soviets are only just beginning to appear so that we have to make concessions to imperialism. Today we cannot build railways on a large scale—God grant that we can handle those already existing. We are short of grain and fuel, we have not got enough locomotives, several million poods of grain are lying on the Volga-Bugulma Railway and we cannot bring it away. In the Council of People's Commissars a few days ago we passed a decision to send representatives with extensive powers to get the grain away from there. The people are hungry in Petrograd and Moscow while millions of poods of

grain are stored there and we cannot get them away because we have not got enough locomotives and there is no fuel. And we say that it is better to pay tribute to foreign capitalists as long as they build railways. We shall not perish on account of that tribute but if we do not organise railway transport we may perish because the people are hungry; great as the endurance of the Russian worker may be, there is a limit to it. It is, therefore, our duty to take measures to improve railway facilities even at the expense of paying tribute to capitalism. Good or bad, there is so far no choice. We shall not ruin Soviet power by paying tribute to world capitalism until it is finally overthrown. We paid gold to the German imperialists, we had to under the terms of the Treaty of Brest, and now the Entente countries are taking that gold away from them—the victorious bandit is robbing the defeated bandit. We say today that as long as the world movement of the proletariat does not bring victory we shall either fight or pay those bandits to buy them off and do not see anything bad in it. While we were buying off the German bandits by paying them a few hundred million we strengthened our Red Army, but the German bandits now have nothing left. That's what will happen to other imperialist bandits. (*Applause.*)

The comrade adds that he was under arrest for four days for opposing the ruin of the middle peasants; he asks what the middle peasant is and refers to a number of peasant revolts. If the comrade was arrested for protesting against the ruin of the middle peasants that was, of course, incorrect, and judging by his speedy release I imagine that either the one who arrested him or some other representative of Soviet power found the action incorrect. Now about the middle peasant. He differs from the kulak in not exploiting the labour of others. The kulak steals other people's money and other people's labour. The poor peasants, the semi-proletarians, are those who are themselves exploited; the middle peasant does not exploit other people, gets his living from his own farm, has approximately enough grain, is no kulak but is not to be classed as poor either. Such peasants waver between us and the kulaks. A few of them may become kulaks if they are lucky, that is why they are attracted to the kulaks, but the majority of them will never be kulaks. If the social-

ists and Communists are able to talk intelligently to the middle peasant they can prove to him that the Soviet government is more advantageous than any other, because other governments oppress and crush the middle peasant. The middle peasant, however, wavers. Today he is for us, tomorrow for some other power; partly for us and partly for the bourgeoisie. In the programme we shall adopt in a few days we are against any kind of force in respect of the middle peasant. Our Party makes this declaration. If there are arrests we condemn them and will put matters right. In respect of the kulak we are for force but in respect of the middle peasant we are against force. To him we say, "If you are on the side of Soviet power we shall not drive you into a commune by force, we have never forced peasants into communes and no decree to that effect exists." If it happens in the localities, it is abuse of power for which the people in office are removed and indicted. This is a big question. The middle peasant stands between two camps. But, comrades, in this case the policy is quite clear—we are against force where the middle peasants are concerned, we favour agreement with them, we favour concessions to them. The middle peasant can and will come to communism by a slow journey. In the freest capitalist republic the middle peasant is threatened by capital that oppresses and crushes him in some way or other.

The next note asks my opinion of the Baltic Fleet. I have not studied the question of the Baltic Fleet and cannot answer at the moment; the speech by the comrade from the fleet probably exhausted that question.

Then there is a question about the mouldiness, moss and red tape that has grown in the localities and about the need to fight it. That is perfectly true. When the October Revolution kicked out the old bureaucrats it did so because it had created the Soviets. It turned out the old judges and made the court a people's court. The court could have been simplified; for this there was no need to know the old laws but simply to be guided by a sense of justice. It was easy to get rid of bureaucratic methods in the courts. In other areas it was much more difficult. We threw out the old bureaucrats, but they have come back, they call themselves "commonists" when they can't bear to say the word Communist, and they wear a red ribbon in their buttonholes and creep into warm

corners. What to do about it? We must fight this scum again and again and if the scum has crawled back we must again and again clean it up, chase it out, keep it under the surveillance of communist workers and peasants whom we have known for more than a month and for more than a year. There is still another question here, a note which says that it is a bad thing to give advantages to members of the Party because scoundrels will worm their way in. We are fighting against that and will continue to do so, comrades; we have passed a decision not to allow members who have been in the Party less than a year to be delegates to a Party congress; we shall continue to adopt such measures. When a party is in power it has to give preference to its members—let us suppose that two men apply, one of them shows a Party membership card and the other has no Party card and both of them are equally unknown; it is natural that preference should be given to the Party member, the one who has the Party card. How can one really decide whether a person is in the Party because of his convictions or for gain? The date he joined the Party must be entered on his Party card, he must not be given the card until he has been tested, until he has been through probation, etc.

There is also a note about the revolutionary tax^a to the effect that it is a burden on the middle peasant. There has been a special session on this question, there were many complaints, and in order to verify them we did the following. We have a Central Statistical Board in which the best specialists in statistics in Russia are employed, most of them Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, Mensheviks and even Cadets; there are very few Communists, Bolsheviks—they were more concerned with the fight against tsarism than with practical work. As far as I have been able to see these specialists are working satisfactorily, although that does not mean that we do not have to fight against some individuals. We gave them the job of making probes in a few volosts to see how the peasants have distributed the revolutionary tax. There are very many complaints; when we realise, however, that they amount to about a thousand for the whole country, then we see that it is an insignificant number for Russia—if there are a thousand complaints to several million farms that is a mere bagatelle; if three people a day come to

the Central Executive Committee that makes 90 complaints a month, but it creates the impression that we are snowed under with complaints. To check up on this we decided to investigate a few volosts and we got a precise answer in Popov's report which was repeated at a sitting of the Central Executive Committee in the presence of workers. The report showed that in the majority of cases the peasants distribute the tax justly. Soviet power demands that the poor do not pay anything, the middle peasants a moderate amount and the rich peasants a lot, although it is, of course, impossible to determine exactly who is rich and who is poor and there have been mistakes, but on the whole the peasants distribute the tax correctly. That's as it should be. (*Applause.*) There have been mistakes, of course. For instance, there was a petty clerk on the railway who complained that the house committee had taxed him unjustly. He informed the Soviet authorities of this. And they said, search his place, he is a profiteer. And they found several sacks containing a million rubles in Kerensky notes. This will continue until we have found a way of changing all the old notes for new ones. When we change these notes for new ones all the profiteers will be exposed. All of them will have to change old notes for new. (*Stormy applause.*) If you present the small amount of money necessary for a working man you will get a ruble for a ruble, if you present one or two thousand—ruble for ruble. If you present more we shall give you some of it in new money and the rest will go into a book—you can wait for it. (*Applause.*) In order to do that sort of thing we have to get the new notes ready. There are about 60,000 million of the old money. We do not need to change such a huge sum for new money, but specialists have computed that we shall need no less than 20,000 million rubles' worth. We already have 17,000 million. (*Applause.*) The question has been raised at the Council of People's Commissars of making the final preparations in the near future for this measure that will strike a blow at the profiteers. This measure will expose those who are concealing Kerensky notes. The measure will require a lot of organisational work, for it is no easy one.

Then there is a question on how matters stand with the sowing, since it is difficult to get enough seed. That, of

course, is true. A Cultivated Land Committee⁹ has been set up. Here, at the Commissariat of Agriculture, a Working Committee¹⁰ has been formed in accordance with a Soviet decree and its work will be organised jointly with the trade unions. Its job will be to see that the land is not left vacant and that any land left vacant by the landowners is given to workers. There is an order to the effect that if the peasants do not take the land the government will try to adapt it to its needs. There is a shortage of seed, of course. In this case the poor peasants must drag out into the open those kulaks who have a hidden surplus grain and have not given it up for seed. It is important to the kulak to conceal these surpluses because he will get a thousand rubles a pood for it in the hungry months and it does not worry him that grain will not be planted and that he will be doing harm to thousands of workers. He is an enemy of the people and he must be exposed.

The next question is about wages; the specialist gets three thousand, he goes from place to place and is difficult to catch. I say this about the specialists—they are people who have a knowledge of bourgeois science and engineering at a higher level than the overwhelming majority of workers and peasants; such specialists are needed and we say that at the moment we cannot introduce equalitarian wages, and are in favour of paying more than three thousand. Even if we pay several million a year in wages it will not be too much as long as we learn to work well with their help. We do not see any other way of arranging things so that they do not work under the lash, and as long as there are few specialists we are compelled to retain high wages. I recently had a talk on this question with Schmidt, the Commissar for Labour, and he agrees with our policy and says that formerly, under capitalism, the wages of an unskilled worker were 25 rubles a month and those of a good specialist not less than 500 rubles, a ratio of 20 to 1; now the lowest wages amount to 600 rubles and the specialists get 3,000, a ratio of 5 to 1. We have, therefore, done a lot to equalise low and high wages and we shall continue in the same vein. At the moment we cannot equalise wages and as long as there are few specialists we shall not refuse to raise their wages. We say that it is better to pay out an extra million or a thousand million

as long as we can employ all the specialists, for what they will teach our workers and peasants is worth more than that thousand million.

Next comes a question about agricultural communes and whether former landowners can be allowed to remain in them. That depends on what the landowner was like. There has been no decree forbidding the landowner admission to the commune. The landowner, of course, does not inspire confidence because he has been oppressing the peasants for centuries and they hate him, but if there are landowners that the peasants know as decent people you not only can but must admit them. We must use such specialists, they are used to organising big farms and there is a lot they can teach peasants and farm workers.

Then it is asked whether the middle peasants should be allowed on public ploughlands. Of course they should. Whole uyezds have recently decided to go over to collective ploughing—to what extent it will be carried out I don't know; for this it is important to attract the middle peasants, because the poor peasants are on our side but the middle peasants—not always, and they have to be won over. We are in favour of using force against the capitalists and against the landowners, and are not only in favour of the use of force but of the confiscation of everything they have accumulated; we are in favour of the use of force against the kulak, but not of his complete expropriation, because he farms the land and part of what he has accumulated comes from his own labour. This is a difference that must be fully understood. The complete expropriation of the landowner and capitalists; not all the property of the kulak can be confiscated, there has been no such order; we want to convince the middle peasant and draw him over to us by example and persuasion. That is our programme. If there are deviations from it in the localities, they are infringements of the decrees of Soviet power either by people who do not want to carry out our decrees or by those who do not understand them.

Then there is a question on how to smarten up the railway workers, and also about the cessation of traffic on the railways. This question has been heatedly discussed by the Council of People's Commissars and many measures have been adopted. This is a fundamental question. Millions of

poods of grain are lying on the Volga-Bugulma Railway and may be ruined because in some places the grain is lying in the snow and when the thaw sets in the grain will be spoiled. It is already damp (up to 20 per cent humidity). This grain must be brought away or it will be destroyed. The main thing is that the railwaymen themselves are badly in need of grain. For this purpose it will be necessary, according to the estimate of our comrades in the Commissariat of Railways, to stop passenger traffic from March 18 to April 10. This cancelling of passenger traffic can give us the three and a half million poods of grain that can be brought out using even light passenger locomotives. If profiteers were to carry grain on those trains they would, at most, bring half a million poods. Those who complain about the cessation of passenger traffic are not in the right. Profiteers would, at best, transport half a million poods and we shall bring in three and a half million, if we fill the cars with grain and if the railwaymen help us, and in this way we shall improve the food situation. That is why we say that all comrades who are more developed and more organised must work for the war and for food. Give us people again and again, no matter how difficult it may be. We know very well that Petrograd has given more people than any other town in Russia, because the most developed and best organised workers are in Petrograd. This, however, is going to be a difficult six months. The first half-year of 1918 produced 27 million poods, and in the second we got 67 million poods. We have reached a hungry half-year. March, April, May and June will be difficult months. We must bend all efforts to prevent this. The question must be raised at every factory and at every study circle of whether there is a man who can be sent to work at a railway workshop and replaced by a woman, and if there is, to send him to that work. In every study circle, in every group and in every organisation thought must be given to this, new workers must be supplied if we are to cope with this difficult half-year. (*Applause.*)

**SESSION OF THE FIRST CONGRESS
OF FARM LABOURERS
OF PETROGRAD GUBERNIA ¹¹
MARCH 13, 1919**

1

**SPEECH ON THE ORGANISATION
OF A FARM LABOURERS' UNION**

Comrades, I am very glad to be able on behalf of the Council of People's Commissars to greet this Congress of Farm Labourers, the object of which is to form a farm labourers' union.

Comrades, the Central Committee of our Party and the All-Russia Council of Trade Unions have on more than one occasion held joint conferences with Comrade Schmidt, People's Commissar for Labour, members of the All-Russia Council of Trade Unions and others, to discuss how to set about organising farm labourers. Nowhere in the world, even in the most advanced capitalist countries, where trade unions have existed not only for decades but for centuries, have farm labourers succeeded in forming anything like permanent trade unions. You know how the conditions of life of the peasants and farm labourers hamper this and the fact that they are scattered and disunited is a great obstacle, so that it is far more difficult for them than for urban workers to unite in a trade union.

The workers' and peasants' government, however, has set to work all along the line to build communist society. It has not only set out to make a clean sweep of the landowners and capitalists—this has been almost completely achieved—but has set out to build a society in which there will

never again be landowners and capitalists. There has been more than one instance in the history of revolutions where, soon after the old landowners and capitalists were swept away, new capitalists sprang up from the ranks of the kulaks, the wealthy peasants, profiteers, who, in many cases, exploited the workers more than the old landowners and capitalists did. The task that confronts us is to sweep away the old capitalists and to make it impossible for new ones to emerge; to see to it that power remains fully, entirely and exclusively in the hands of those who work, who live by their own labour. How can this be done? There is only one way, and that is by organising the rural workers, the proletarians. This organisation must be permanent. Only in a permanent, mass organisation can farm labourers learn the business of managing large-scale farms; for if they do not learn to do this themselves, nobody will do it for them. You remember the words to this effect in our anthem, the *Internationale*. The most the Soviet government can do is to give such an organisation every assistance. The capitalist organisations did everything in their power, resorted to every lawful means, various ruses, police devices, honest and dishonest schemes to prevent labourers from organising. To this day in Germany, the most advanced country in Europe, farm labourers are deprived of the right to organise. There, the ancient master and servant law is still in force, and farm labourers continue to have the status of servants. Quite recently I had a conversation with a prominent Englishman who came to Russia during the war. In the past he sided with capitalism, but in the course of our revolution he developed splendidly, first into a Menshevik and later into a Bolshevik. During our conversation we discussed labour conditions in England—there are no peasants in England, there are only big capitalists and farm workers—and he said, “I am not hopeful, because our farm labourers live under feudal and not capitalist conditions; they are so overburdened, crushed and ground down by toil, that it is difficult for them to unite.” And this is in a most advanced country, where a certain farm labourer attempted to form a farm labourers’ union quite half a century ago. This is what progress amounts to in the free capitalist countries! Our government, however, decided to help to organise the rural and other workers as soon as it came into being. We must render

every assistance. I am particularly pleased to note that here, in Petrograd, where there are so many beautiful buildings, palaces, which were not built for the right purposes, our comrades have quite properly converted them into premises for meetings, congresses and conferences of precisely those classes of the population which worked to build them, which have built them for centuries, but which were never allowed to come within a mile of them! (*Applause.*) I think, comrades, that now that nearly all the palaces in Petrograd have been converted into meeting halls and premises for unions of workers—primarily urban, but also rural workers, the working section of the peasantry—I think that we may regard this as a first step towards providing the working people, the formerly exploited section of the population, with the opportunity to organise. I repeat, the Soviet government will do all in its power immediately and unconditionally to help such an organisation to remould rural life and leave no room for kulaks or profiteers, so that co-operative labour, labour in common, may become the general rule in the countryside. This is the task we have all set ourselves. You know perfectly well how difficult this task is, that it is impossible to change all the conditions of rural life by means of decrees, laws and ordinances. It was possible by means of ordinances and decrees to overthrow the landowners and capitalists, it is possible by this means to curb the kulaks. But if the millions of farm labourers will not have their own organisation, if they do not learn in this organisation, step by step, to manage their own affairs, political and economic—and the economic affairs are most important—if they do not learn to manage large-scale farms and transform them—since they enjoy a number of privileges which other farms do not—from models of exploitation where formerly the workers had their sweat and blood squeezed out of them, into model co-operative farms, the working people themselves will be to blame for it. The old farms cannot now be restored. It is impossible for us to provide ten good horses and ten good ploughs for every hundred dessiatines of land (if we take ten small farms of ten dessiatines each). We have not that number of horses or ploughs left. But if the same hundred dessiatines are cultivated on a large scale on the basis of co-operative or common tillage, or as a voluntary agricultural

commune, we shall need, probably, not ten horses and ploughs, but only three. This is how a saving in human labour and better results can be achieved. But there is only one way to achieve this, and that is by an alliance of urban and rural workers. The urban workers have taken power in the cities. All the best that has been created in the cities in the shape of palaces, fine buildings and culture, the workers place at the disposal of the rural population, for they know that their power in the cities cannot be durable unless a sound alliance is established with the farm workers. Only such an alliance, the foundations of which you are here laying down, can make a permanent change possible. The middle peasants, too, will voluntarily join this alliance. It will entail a vast amount of effort, of course, but nothing can be done at one stroke. If your union is formed, if it grows, develops and spreads all over Russia, if it maintains the closest contact with the urban workers' union, we shall fulfil this difficult task by the joint efforts of millions of organised farm and urban workers and thus extricate ourselves from the state of ruin into which we and all other nations were plunged by the four years' war. We shall emerge from this state, but we shall not go back to the old system of individual and scattered production—this system of production condemns man to ignorance, poverty, disunity; we shall organise collective, large-scale, co-operative production. For this, all that human knowledge, human skill and human invention have achieved, all the knowledge of the specialists, must be devoted to the service of the united workers. The workers must become the masters in all fields; they must learn to be managers and to direct those who up to now, like many agronomists, for example, acted as stewards for the capitalists against the workers. This is no easy problem, but in the towns very much has been done to solve it. You are now taking the first steps towards solving this problem in the rural districts. Permit me to conclude by repeating my greetings from the Council of People's Commissars and to express once again the firm conviction that the union of which you are here laying the foundations will in the near future grow into a united All-Russia Farm Labourers' Union. This union will serve as a genuine bulwark of Soviet power in the rural districts, as the vanguard in the struggle to remould rural life in such a way

as to prevent the revival of any exploitation, of the rule of the rich over the poor, on the basis of common, united, co-operative labour. This is what I wish you, comrades. (*Applause.*)

Brief report published
in *Severnaya Kommuna* No. 58,
March 14, 1919

Published according to
the verbatim report, verified
with the text in the journal

2

REPLIES TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Two notes have been handed up, both asking whether workers in state farms are allowed to keep their own small livestock, vegetable plots and poultry. I have just asked for a copy of the act we recently discussed in the Council of People's Commissars and which was passed by the Central Executive Committee. This act is entitled "Statute on Socialist Land Settlement and the Measures for the Transition to Socialist Farming". I don't know whether a copy of this act is available here. I helped to draft it and delivered a report on it to the Commission set up by the Central Executive Committee. If my memory does not betray me—we have so many laws that one cannot remember them all, and many more acts have been passed since then—I think this act contains a clause which prohibits workers in state farms from keeping their own livestock and holding separate vegetable plots. I should like to have a copy of that act and consult it. (*A copy of the act is handed to Lenin.*) Here is Clause 46: "No worker or office employee in a state farm shall have the right to keep his own livestock, poultry, or vegetable plot." Thus, it turns out that not all of you were aware of the existence of this act. One of the comrades in the Presidium told me that there was a heated debate on this question at this Congress. I do not quite understand why. I have just been handed a copy of *Izvestia* containing this act entitled "Statute on Socialist Land Settlement and the Measures for the Transition to Socialist Farming". Why was this clause inserted in the act? To introduce labour in common on a common farm. If private vegetable plots, animals, poultry, and so forth, were permitted again, we should revert to the small farming that had existed

hitherto. If that were the case, would it be worth while to have all this bother. Would it be worth while establishing state farms? It goes without saying that if you discuss this question and, knowing as you do the conditions prevailing in Petrograd Gubernia—I am told that this Congress consists solely of representatives of Petrograd Gubernia—if on the basis of your experience of what has been done in Petrograd Gubernia, and in spite of all the arguments in favour of common production, you arrive at the conclusion that a temporary exception should be made for this gubernia, we shall re-examine the question. Only, you must try to prove to us that such an exception is really necessary, that special conditions, absent in other gubernias, prevail in Petrograd Gubernia, otherwise, all the others will demand the same exception. Then you must explain that you regard the measure you recommend to the government, or on which you insist, as a temporary one, for there can hardly be any dispute about the fact that a state farm deserving the name must be run on the basis of common labour. We have had the old system of labour whereby each peasant toiled on his own strip of land, had his own farm-house, his own cattle, poultry, harrow, wooden plough, and so forth, for many years, for many centuries. We know perfectly well that in Russia and in other countries this resulted in the peasants remaining ignorant and poverty-stricken with the rich oppressing the poor, for the problems that have to be faced in agriculture cannot be solved on individual lines. If we attempt it, it will only result in a reversion to the former poverty, from which only one in a hundred, or perhaps, five out of a hundred, climb into the ranks of the more well-to-do, while the rest live in want. That is why our task is now to go over to the collective tillage of the land, to large-scale farming in common. But the Soviet government must not under any circumstances resort to coercion. There is no law which makes this compulsory. Agricultural communes are established on a voluntary basis; the adoption of collective tillage must be voluntary; the workers' and peasants' government must refrain from exercising the slightest compulsion, and the law prohibits this. If anyone of you here knows of cases of compulsion, then please regard it as an abuse of power, an infringement of the law, which we shall do our utmost to rectify, which we shall

rectify. Organised farm labourers must help us; only with the aid of their organisation shall we be able to prevent such abuses. The state farms, however, are something different. They were never in the hands of individual small farmers. The Soviet government takes them over and says that we shall send the available agronomists to them and transfer to them all the farm implements that have remained intact. If we succeed in bringing the war to a close and conclude peace with America, we shall order a shipload of up-to-date implements and supply the state farms with them so that these large-scale farms may by common labour produce better than before, at lower cost than before, and more than before. It will be the function of the state farms gradually to teach the rural population to work out for themselves the new system, the system of common labour, which will prevent the resurgence of a handful of rich men to exploit the masses of the poor as was always the case in the rural districts, not only in this country but also in the most free of republics. You know perfectly well that there are still large numbers of peasant profiteers in the rural districts who piled up hundreds of thousands of rubles during the war, who are hoarding Kerensky notes in anticipation of being able to invest them again and so exploit the poor peasants. What measures can be taken to combat this? None, except the adoption of collective farming. Agricultural communes must be formed on an entirely voluntary basis; there must be no coercion whatever. The same applies to collective tillage of the land. State farms are established on nationalised land. You know that on the demand of the vast majority of the peasants the private ownership of land was entirely abolished on October 26, 1917, on the first night after our Soviet revolution. These large-scale farms established on nationalised land are called state farms. Can we allow the old system of small farming to revive on state farms? I think you will all agree that we cannot, and must not do so. If the economic conditions prevailing in Petrograd Gubernia, the conditions of practical work with which you are closely familiar, and which we, of course, could not take into account as we were not aware of them—if, after thoroughly discussing the matter from all angles you arrive at the conclusion that these conditions make an exception necessary in the case of Petrograd Gubernia,

that for a time it should be exempted, then, in order that we may revise our decision you must try to submit the most definite proof possible that this is necessary, and if you do I promise that we shall discuss this matter again in the Council of People's Commissars, in the light of the decision of your Congress, and examine it again in the Central Executive Committee. We shall discuss whether Petrograd Gubernia should be exempted for a time, and under certain conditions, from the operation of Clause 46, which prohibits the possession of vegetable plots, small livestock, poultry, and so forth by state farm employees. Although we agree that it is necessary to adopt farming in common, and although all the work will be conducted on these lines, nevertheless, on the recommendation of people who are familiar with the practical side of the work, we shall make an exception—we shall not refuse to do so, for sometimes it is necessary to make exceptions. We trust that by working on these lines good progress will be made, and that we shall succeed in laying the foundations of real socialist agriculture. (*Applause.*)

Published according to
the verbatim report

**SPEECH DELIVERED AT A MEETING
IN THE PEOPLE'S HOUSE, PETROGRAD
MARCH 13, 1919**

NEWSPAPER REPORT

"The question that mainly interests most of you is the food situation, and what the Council of People's Commissars has done in the matter. Permit me to tell you briefly what it has done. We have entered into a severe, hungry half-year, and all our enemies at home and abroad, including the Right and Left Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks, knowing what hardships the people are suffering, are trying to make capital out of it, are trying to overthrow the Soviet government and thus, whether they realise it or not, restore the rule of the landowners and capitalists. We have entered a period when the collection of grain at its source is exceeding deliveries, and the establishment of Soviet power in the Ukraine gives us grounds for hoping that we shall be able to cope with the food situation in the coming half-year better than we did last year, although we shall now have to pull through a half-year that will be more severe than the preceding one. The fact that a considerable section of the peasant masses has turned in favour of Soviet power is a great gain for us. In those regions where the Czechoslovaks¹ were, the Trans-Volga region and Ufa Gubernia, the attitude of even the well-to-do peasants has changed abruptly in favour of Soviet power, for the Czechoslovaks taught them a severe lesson. Only a few days ago a delegation of peasants representing five volosts in the Sarapul Uyezd came to see me. These are the volosts which quite recently sent 40,000 poods of grain each to Moscow and Petrograd. I asked the delegation to tell me what the

attitude of the peasants was towards the Soviet government, and I received the following reply. 'Yes, the Czechoslovaks taught us a lesson, and now, nobody will turn us away from the Soviet government.' In other regions, too, in the cis-Urals, for example, where, incidentally, there are huge stocks of grain, the peasants are now on the side of the Soviets. At one time, influenced by the Mensheviks and Left Socialist-Revolutionaries—you will remember the Left Socialist-Revolutionary Muravyov nearly succeeded in opening our front to the Czechoslovaks—the peasants in these regions were hostile to the Soviets. But the atrocities perpetrated by the officers of the Czechoslovak army, their brutal treatment of the population, their attempts to restore the old tsarist and landowner system in its entirety—all this taught the peasants a lesson. At the present time Soviet activities are being carried on in those gubernias with a zest that you here can scarcely imagine, for here, in the large centres, the people are exhausted by lengthy undernourishment, whereas in those regions, where there are fairly large stocks of grain, problems of filling the stomach recede into the background.

"I now come to the details. In Ufa Gubernia there are stocks of grain amounting to 60,000,000 poods, procurement is proceeding rapidly, but we are encountering colossal transport difficulties. On the railways, on the Kazan-Sarapul and Volga-Bugulma lines, we have about 10,000,000 poods of grain already collected, but we cannot transport it owing to the shortage of locomotives, trucks and fuel and the exceedingly bad state of the available locomotives. To increase the carrying capacity of our railways we have been obliged to resort to an extremely radical measure; we have decided to suspend all passenger traffic on the railways all over Russia for a period extending from March 18 to April 10. Before deciding on this measure we discussed it three times with our railwaymen comrades and with prominent railway experts. Only after we had discussed the matter from every angle and had weighed up all probable consequences did we make the decision. Our calculations showed that the suspension of passenger traffic will release 220 locomotives; although they are of low power they are capable of transporting 3,500,000 poods of grain. If we cal-

culate the amount of grain the private profiteers carry—there were weeks when we were obliged to allow them to transport food unhindered—we shall find that in a period of three weeks these profiteers might bring in no more than 200,000 poods. That decided the issue. The kulaks, profiteers, and even individual workers, will, of course, raise a howl about this and say that we are depriving the people of the only opportunity they have of bringing in even a pood or so of grain. We know that the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks will appear on the scene and try to take advantage of the famine to turn the people against the Soviet government. But here, as in all other cases of difficulty, we rely exclusively on the class-consciousness of the masses of the advanced workers. Better suffer privation, better encounter the hostile agitation of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, but face up to the danger and say frankly, 'We shall not extricate ourselves from our food difficulties unless we adopt the most radical measures and strain every nerve to transport the grain.' In many places grain intended for delivery has been piled near the railway stations on the bare ground and is in danger of being swept away by the spring floods. Measures must be taken to accelerate loading and transport. In deciding on this radical measure we took into account all the contingent circumstances. We know that before Easter there is a heavy increase in the number of workingmen passengers on the railways and that is why we decided to restore passenger traffic by that time. We know, too, that the suburban services are absolutely essential for the workers, and we therefore decided not to suspend them. We have sent our most energetic and experienced comrades to various localities. To Ufa Gubernia we have sent Comrade Bryukhanov, Deputy Commissar for Food, who is closely familiar with conditions in that gubernia. He will be assisted by comrades from the War Department, for the front is not far away. We have also sent comrades from the War Department to the other railway line, Kazan-Sarapul. They have been instructed to mobilise the local peasants and to strain every nerve to get the grain moved, at least as far as Kazan. In this way we shall save it and ensure its delivery to the metropolitan cities and the non-agricultural

districts. On this we base our hope of defeating the famine. The attempt of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries to make capital out of the people's misfortunes will be thwarted once again.

"Unlike the situation last year, when the Czechoslovaks were attacking us and had deprived us of our most fertile regions, we now have two new sources of grain supply, on which our food supply authorities could not count last autumn when they drew up their food supply plans for the whole year. These sources are the Ukraine and the Don region. Last autumn the Germans were still in occupation of the Ukraine. The German imperialists counted on shipping 60,000,000 poods of grain from the Ukraine to Germany, and with this flood of foodstuff hoped to destroy the germs of Bolshevism among the masses of the German people. But something entirely different happened. Instead of 60,000,000 poods the Germans shipped only 9,000,000 poods from the Ukraine. But they shipped the seeds of Bolshevism with this grain and they are growing splendidly in Germany. In Germany today, Bolshevism is fighting the social-traitors in the streets of Berlin, where workers' blood is flowing, shed by the social-traitors. We are convinced that the German social-traitors will be vanquished just as Kerensky was vanquished in this country. (*Applause.*)

"But in addition to the Ukraine we have the Don region. Krasnov's Cossacks have been able to hold out all this time with the aid of foreign gold, first German and later Anglo-French. But this does not help—our victory over the Cossacks is certain. At the present time we are holding the Tsaritsyn-Likhaya line, the link between grain and coal supplies. Thus, we have two sources of supply—the Ukraine and the Don region. The Ukraine is a fraternal Soviet republic, with which we are on the best of terms. This republic is settling the question of assisting us not as a huckster, not as a profiteer; the Ukraine is guided exclusively by an ardent desire to assist the hungry North. The first socialist duty of every citizen of the Ukraine is to come to the aid of the North. But in the Ukraine, too, we are encountering tremendous difficulties. The Council of People's Commissars has repeatedly invited Comrade Rakovskiy to meet us to discuss the matter, and has sent military men to the Ukraine. But it

appears that as regards organisation, matters are in a worse state in the Ukraine than they were here after the October Revolution. Kerensky left us something of a food supply organisation. The food supply officials sabotaged us, of course, and came to the Smolny not to co-operate but to bargain with us. But we broke the resistance of these groups and in the end compelled them to work. In the Ukraine they have no food supply organisation whatever. The Germans, when they were there, only engaged in plunder; they plundered as long as they had the power to do so, and, of course, they left no food supply organisation. The Ukraine has no officials experienced in handling food supplies, or large working-class centres from which capable men could be drawn. The Donets Basin has been devastated to a degree that one cannot even imagine. To this day gangs of Cossacks are roaming in the remoter parts of the region robbing the local population. From all parts of the Ukraine we hear the cry 'Send us workers!' We have set up a food supply bureau there consisting of representatives of the trade union movement. We are transferring there the more experienced food supply officials from Voronezh and Tambov gubernias, and we are enlisting the more capable urban proletarians for the food supply organisations. Nevertheless no grain has been procured in the Ukraine, there are no purchasing organisations, the peasants have no confidence in our currency, and we have no goods with which to barter. Notwithstanding all these unfavourable circumstances, we have given the Ukrainian comrades the assignment to ship to Russia 50,000,000 poods of grain by June 1, 1919. I do not think this will be carried out in full, but it will be good if only a half, or two-thirds is delivered!"

Lenin then went on to say that the victories we have gained in the Don region were due entirely to the intensification of Party activities and to cultural and educational work in the ranks of the Red Army.

"This brought about a psychological change, and as a result our Red Army won the Don region for us." (*Stormy applause.*)

"Generally speaking, our Red Army is growing stronger day after day. Even the bourgeois military experts admit that in the imperialist countries the armies are disintegrat-

ing, whereas our army is becoming sounder, is maturing and growing stronger. In the Don region, too, there are large stocks of grain, and there is no food supply organisation there; but we have there our disciplined army, and this is already an organisation by means of which we shall obtain grain with the minimum of expenditure and the maximum results.

"I must say that the Czechoslovaks and the Cossacks are continuing their tactics of destroying all they can. They blew up the railway bridge across the Volga and then destroyed all other railway bridges and put all the Trans-Volga main lines out of commission. The Council of People's Commissars for a long time discussed ways and means of restoring at least two lines: Liski-Rostov and Likhaya-Tsaritsyn. Radical measures have been adopted, and at the last meeting of the Council of Defence held on Monday, March 10, it was reported that all the necessary tools and materials had already been delivered to these lines and that they would be restored before the spring thaw makes the roads impassable."

Referring once again to the assistance which the Don region and the Ukraine will render us in the way of food supplies, Lenin exclaimed: "This half-year is the last severe half-year!" (*Applause.*)

"The international situation, though still acute, is nevertheless improving. All of you saw and heard the foreign delegates to the Third International¹³ who in their speeches and reports emphasised that the road we have taken is the right one. Bolshevism has become an international force. This is evident from the fact that the most advanced bourgeois democracies, which boast so much of their liberties, are taking stern measures against the Bolsheviks. The United States of America, one of the richest bourgeois republics in the world, with its hundred million population, is hastening to deport several hundred Russian Bolsheviks, most of whom do not even speak English. Whence this horror of Bolshevism? As the newspapers report, at workers' meetings in Paris, even those workers who do not sympathise with the Bolsheviks refuse to give a hearing to speakers who are hostile to Bolshevism. (*Applause.*) Notwithstanding the flood of lies and calumny which the bourgeois press of Western Europe daily turns

against the Bolsheviks, the people have learned the truth and are siding with the Bolsheviks. Let the French bourgeois press say that the Bolsheviks are inhuman monsters who gobble up little children—the French workers do not trust that press.

"We have succeeded in making the word 'Soviet' intelligible in all languages. The masses have realised that their salvation lies in a workers' and peasants' government, in Soviets. That is why it was so easy for us to reach agreement at the Congress of the Third International in Moscow. In the most remote corners, in some Italian Poshekhonye,¹⁴ farm labourers and workers gather together and declare, 'We greet the German Spartacists and the Russian "Sovietists" and demand that their programme shall become the programme of the workers of the world.' I shall repeat here what I have already said in Moscow.¹⁵ This shows that victory will be ours, and there can be no doubt about this whatever. We have won the sympathies of the workers in spite of the lies uttered by the bourgeois press. Meanwhile, the imperialists at the peace conference cannot reach an agreement and are ready to fly at each other's throats. The Bolshevik contagion has already spread to all the countries of Europe and America. Deporting Bolsheviks will be of no avail. Even if Western Europe were to isolate itself from us by means of a Chinese Wall, even if all the Russian Bolsheviks disappeared into the underworld, it would not relieve the position of the Western imperialists. The masses of the people have realised that they cannot improve their conditions with the aid of parliament. A workers' government, Soviets, are needed. Huge debts accrue from the war, and the imperialists have lost their senses to such an extent that they are demanding that the nations should pay their war debts. They say to the nations, 'Pay us millions and millions for having been kind enough to permit the slaughter of 10,000,000 men to settle the question of our profits!' In all countries imperialism is slipping into the abyss into which German imperialism has fallen." (*Stormy applause.*)

THE ACHIEVEMENTS AND DIFFICULTIES OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT

**Published in pamphlet form
by the Petrograd Soviet of Workers'
and Red Army Deputies,
March-April 1919**

**Published according to
the pamphlet,
afterword according to
the manuscript**

It is now the right time, when we have succeeded in restoring the revolutionary International, the Communist International, when the Soviet form of the movement has itself become both the theoretical and practical programme of the entire Third International—now that this has been done it is appropriate to review the general course of development of the Soviets. What are the Soviets? What is the significance of this form which was created by the masses, and was not invented by any individual?

It seems to me that the tasks now confronting us, the proletariat that has won power, can be appraised only from this angle, as can also the degree to which we have attempted to fulfil these tasks and the degree to which we have succeeded during the past year under the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia.

Only in the light of the general role of the Soviets, of their general significance, of the place they occupy in world history, is it possible to understand the situation we found ourselves in, why we had to act in the way we did and in no other, and how, looking back, we must examine the correctness or incorrectness of the steps we took.

And we are now doubly in need of such a more general, broader, and more far-reaching outlook, because it is sometimes painful for Party people in Russia to see faults and defects and feel dissatisfied with their work, because the practical fulfilment of the urgent, current, immediate, everyday administrative duties that have been, and continue to be, the lot of the Soviet authorities often distracts attention, compels us, in spite of ourselves—it is no use rebelling against the conditions under which we have to work—to devote too much attention to the petty details of administration. They cause us to forget the general course of the world-wide development

of the proletarian dictatorship, its evolution through Soviet power or, more correctly, the Soviet movement, through the groping of the proletarian masses within the Soviets—something we all experienced and have forgotten—and through the attempt to achieve the dictatorship within the Soviets.

These are the difficulties we have encountered and the general tasks to which, in my opinion, we must turn our attention so that we may as far as possible get away from the petty details of administration in which everybody who is engaged in practical local government work is absorbed, and so that we may understand what a long way we, as a contingent of the world proletarian army, have still to go.

Complete and final victory on a world scale cannot be achieved in Russia alone; it can be achieved only when the proletariat is victorious in at least all the advanced countries, or, at all events, in some of the largest of the advanced countries. Only then shall we be able to say with absolute confidence that the cause of the proletariat has triumphed, that our first objective—the overthrow of capitalism—has been achieved.

We have achieved this objective in one country, and this confronts us with a second task. Since Soviet power has been established, since the bourgeoisie has been overthrown in one country, the second task is to wage the struggle on a world scale, on a different plane, the struggle of the proletarian state surrounded by capitalist states.

This situation is an entirely novel and difficult one.

On the other hand, since the rule of the bourgeoisie has been overthrown, the main task is to organise the development of the country.

The yellow socialists who have gathered in Berne and now intend to honour us with a visit by distinguished foreigners, are extremely fond of repeating that "the Bolsheviks believe in the almighty power of violence". This phrase only shows that those who use it are people, who in the heat of the revolutionary struggle, when they are being completely crushed by the violence of the bourgeoisie—look at what is going on in Germany—are incapable of teaching their own proletariat the tactics of *necessary violence*.

Under certain circumstances violence is both necessary and useful, but there are circumstances under which violence

cannot produce results. There have been cases, however, of not everyone appreciating this difference, so that it must be discussed. In October violence—the overthrow of the bourgeoisie by Soviet power, the removal of the old government, revolutionary violence—resulted in a brilliant success.

Why? First, because the masses were organised in Soviets, and secondly, because in the long political period, from February to October, the position of the enemy—the bourgeoisie—was undermined, sapped, washed away, like a block of ice by the spring thaw, and internally had been deprived of his strength; and the movement in October, compared, say, with the present revolutionary movement in Germany, brought us such a complete and brilliant victory for revolutionary violence.

May we assume that such a path, such a form of struggle, such an easy victory for revolutionary violence, is possible if these conditions do not exist?

It would be a very great mistake to assume that. And the greater the revolutionary victories achieved under certain specific conditions the more often does the danger arise of our allowing ourselves to be flattered by such victories and not stopping to think coolly, calmly and attentively, about the conditions that made them possible.

When we tore the Kerensky government and Milyukov's coalition ministry to shreds, so to speak, compelled them to shuffle portfolios over and over again, compelled them to play ministerial leapfrog from right to left, from left to right, up and down and down and up, it became obvious that they could not pull together, no matter in what order they sat, and then they were blown away like so much chaff.

Is the situation that now confronts our practical tasks in respect of world imperialism anything like that? Of course not.

That is why the Treaty of Brest created serious difficulties in the sphere of foreign policy, but the mass character of the movement helped us to overcome them.

But what is the source of the mistakes that caused some of our comrades to think that we were committing a heinous crime? There is still an odd crank or two among people able

to wield the pen who imagine that they are somebodies, that they have experience, can teach others, and so forth, who even now assert that this was a compromise with German imperialism.

Yes, we made the same compromise when we "compromised" with the tsar by entering the disgusting, reactionary Duma and undermining it from within.

Can we count on the overthrow of world imperialism merely by force before the proletariat in those imperialist countries has reached the necessary stage of development?

If the question is presented in this way—and we as Marxists have always taught that this is the only way to present the question—we must agree that it would be very absurd and foolish to employ the policy of violence under those circumstances, and complete failure to understand the conditions under which a policy of violence can be successful.

Now we realise this; we have gained experience.

While we, at the time of the Treaty of Brest, were obliged to muster our forces and amidst the most extraordinary difficulties lay the foundations of a new army, the Red Army, in a country ruined and exhausted by war to a greater degree than any other country in the world, while we, in the first half and the beginning of the second half of 1918, were, stone by stone, laying the foundations of a genuine socialist Red Army, the imperialism of other countries was being sapped by internal disintegration and the growing discontent, and was becoming enfeebled.

And revolutionary violence triumphed in Germany after many months of development of the struggle had sapped the strength of imperialism in that country; and the same thing is now being repeated to some extent—to some extent, but not entirely—in the Entente countries.

An American who had watched events in the West-European countries very closely, at first hand, and without prejudice, said to me recently, "France is undoubtedly on the eve of a great disappointment, the collapse of illusions. The French people are being fed with promises—you are the victors, they are told." The bourgeoisie is taking advantage of the old patriotic sentiments of the entire French nation, of their anger at the way they were crushed in 1870, and of their fury at the way the country has been depopulated, bled

white and exhausted by four years of war—the bourgeoisie is taking advantage of all this to divert these sentiments into chauvinist channels: “We have beaten the Germans; our pockets will now be filled, and we shall be able to relax.” But the dispassionate American, looking at things like a businessman, says, “The Germans will not pay, for they have nothing to pay with.”

That is why the French nation is being fed with promises and fairy-tales about the peace, the final victory, that is coming soon. But peace means the collapse of all hopes of being able to crawl out of this bloody mire at least partly alive—with broken arms and legs, but alive. It will be impossible to crawl out of this peace while the old capitalist system is intact, because the war has piled up such a heap of debts, such a mass of ruins throughout the capitalist world, that it is impossible to crawl out of it without upsetting the whole pile and starting an avalanche.

Even those who are not revolutionaries, who have no faith in revolution, and dread it, are nevertheless discussing it theoretically and will be convinced by the course of events, by the consequences of the imperialist war, that there is no way out except revolution.

I repeat, I was particularly astonished by the American's appraisal of the situation from the point of view of a businessman who, of course, has not studied the theory of the class struggle and sincerely thinks it is nonsense, but who is interested in millions and thousands of millions, and being able to count, asks: “Will they pay or not?” And he answers, again from the shrewd businessman's point of view: “They have nothing to pay with! You will not even get 20 kopeks in the ruble!”

It is in such a situation in all the Entente countries that we see profound and widespread unrest stimulated by the workers' sympathy for the Soviet form.

A Paris crowd, for example, is perhaps more sensitive than any assembly of people in any other country, because the people there have had a very good schooling, they have made a number of revolutions—and there, this most responsive crowd, which will not allow a speaker to strike a false note, now interrupts those who dare to say anything against the Bolsheviks. And yet, only a few months ago, nobody

could even as much as hint that he is in favour of Bolshevism without being jeered at by the very same crowd.

Meanwhile the Paris bourgeoisie has set its entire machine of lies, slander and deception in motion against Bolshevism. But now we know what this means, for in 1917 we Bolsheviks experienced the persecution of the entire bourgeois press. The bourgeoisie in our country, however, miscalculated slightly and overdid it in thinking that they could enmesh the Bolsheviks in their net of slander; they overdid things so badly, they went so far in their attacks that they gave us a free advertisement and compelled even the most backward workers to say to themselves: "Well, if the capitalists are abusing the Bolsheviks so much, it shows that those Bolsheviks know how to fight the capitalists!"

That is why the policy which we were obliged to pursue at the time of the Brest peace, a most brutal, violent and humiliating peace, proved to be the only correct policy that could have been pursued.

And I think that it will be useful to recall this policy once again at the present time when a similar situation is arising in the Entente countries, when there, too, the bourgeoisie is filled with a mad desire to thrust their debts, poverty and ruin on Russia, to plunder Russia and crush her in order to divert the rising anger of the masses of their own working people from themselves.

Looking at the situation dispassionately we must say to ourselves very clearly, if we do not want to fool ourselves and others—this is a dangerous thing for revolutionaries to indulge in—we must say that as far as military strength is concerned, the Entente is stronger than we are. But if we look at things in the light of their development, we shall also say very definitely and with a conviction based not only on our revolutionary views but also on our experience, that the strength of the Entente countries will not last, they are on the threshold of a great and abrupt change in the temper of their masses.

They have been feeding both French and British workers with promises, saying, "We shall finish plundering the whole world and you will have enough to eat." This is what the bourgeois press is shouting and dinning into the ears of the ignorant masses.

They will probably conclude peace in a few months—if they do not quarrel among themselves in the meantime, and there are a number of serious symptoms that this is possible. But if they succeed in concluding peace without flying at each other's throats, this peace will be the beginning of an immediate collapse, because these unprecedented debts cannot be paid, and they can do nothing to alleviate the desperate state of ruin, when in France the production of wheat has dropped to less than half and famine is knocking at the door everywhere, and the productive forces have been destroyed; they are unable to do anything about it.

If we look at the situation soberly we shall have to admit that the method of appraising affairs which proved so correct in appraising the Russian revolution is, day after day, indicating the coming of the world revolution. We know that the streams that will carry with them the icebergs of the Entente, of capitalism, of imperialism, are gaining strength day after day.

On the one hand, the Entente countries are stronger than we are; but on the other hand, they cannot possibly hold out long owing to the internal situation.

It is this situation that determines the intricate tasks of international policy—tasks which we may, and probably will, have to tackle in the very near future, and which, though I am insufficiently informed about them in all their detail, I would like to talk to you about most of all so that a picture of the experience of the work done by the Council of People's Commissars, work in the sphere of foreign policy, will be presented to you, comrades, in a clear and interesting form.

The most important of our experiences is the Brest peace. This is the most significant result of the foreign policy of the Council of People's Commissars. We were obliged to play for time, to retreat, manoeuvre and sign a most humiliating peace treaty, and in this way gain an opportunity to lay the foundation of a new socialist army. This foundation we have laid, while our once mighty and all-powerful enemy is already powerless.

All over the world things are moving in the same direction, and this is the chief and principal lesson that we must learn and try to understand as clearly as possible in order to

avoid making mistakes in the extremely intricate, extremely difficult and extremely involved problems of foreign policy which any day may confront the Council of People's Commissars, the Central Executive Committee, and Soviet power as a whole.

I shall conclude my remarks on foreign policy with this and proceed to deal with some other extremely important questions.

Comrades, as regards activities in the military field—a year ago, in February and March 1918, we had no army at all. We had, perhaps, ten million armed workers and peasants who constituted the old army that had collapsed completely, was fully ready and determined to desert, to flee, to abandon everything, come what may.

At that time this was regarded as an exclusively Russian phenomenon. People thought that owing to the Russians' characteristic impatience, or lack of organisation, they would not hold out, whereas the Germans would.

That is what we were told. And now we see that a few months have passed and the same thing has happened to the German army, which was immeasurably superior to ours in culture, equipment, and discipline, in providing decent conditions for the sick and wounded, as regards home leave, and so forth. Even the most cultured and disciplined masses could not stand the slaughter, the many years of slaughter, and so a period of absolute disintegration set in when even the advanced German army broke down.

Evidently, there is a limit not only for Russia but for all countries. There are different limits for different countries, but for all of them there is a limit beyond which it is impossible to continue to wage war for the sake of the interests of the capitalists. This is what we see today.

German imperialism has completely exposed itself as a predator. The most important thing is that even in America and in France, in these notorious democracies (the traitors to socialism, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, those hapless people who call themselves socialists, are fond of chattering about democracies), in these most advanced democracies of the world, in these republics, imperialism is becoming more arrogant every day and we find there beasts of prey more predatory than anywhere else.

They are plundering the world, fighting each other, and arming against each other. This cannot be concealed for long. It could be concealed when the war fever was at its height. But the fever is subsiding, peace is approaching, and it is precisely in these democracies that the masses see, in spite of all the lies they are being told, that the war has led to fresh plunder, that the most democratic republic is nothing more nor less than a disguise for the most brutal and cynical predator who is ready to ruin hundreds of millions of people in order to pay the debts, that is, to pay the imperialist gentlemen, the capitalists, for being good enough to allow the workers to cut each other's throats. This is becoming clearer to the masses every day.

It is this situation that makes possible political statements such as the article written by the military correspondent of a newspaper that belongs to the richest and most politically experienced bourgeoisie, the London *Times*; the author appraises events by saying that all over the world the armies are breaking up and there is only one country where the army is being built up, and that country is Russia.

The bourgeoisie—which militarily is far stronger than Soviet Bolshevism—is compelled to admit this fact. And this fact serves as a criterion of what we have accomplished in the course of our Soviet activities in the past year.

We succeeded in reaching a turning-point where instead of an army of ten million, the bulk of which had deserted, unable to stand the horrors of war, and which had realised that this was a criminal war, we began to build, one hundred thousand after another, a socialist army, which knows what it is fighting for and is ready to make greater sacrifices and suffer more privation than under tsarism. For this army knows that it is fighting for its own cause, for its own land, for its own power in the factories, that it is defending the power of the working people, and that the working people of other countries are awakening, slowly and with great difficulty, but awakening nevertheless.

This is the situation that characterises the year's experience of Soviet power.

War is an incredible hardship for Soviet Russia, war is an incredible hardship for a people who for four years have borne the horrors of the imperialist war. For Soviet

Russia war is an incredibly heavy burden. But at the present time even our powerful enemies admit that their armies are cracking up, whereas our army is being built. For the first time in history an army is being built on the basis of the closest contact, inseverable contact, coalescence, one might say, of the army and the Soviets. The Soviets unite all the working people, all the exploited, and the army is being built up for the purpose of socialist defence and on the basis of class-consciousness.

An eighteenth-century Prussian monarch once wisely remarked: "If our soldiers knew what we were fighting for, it would be impossible to wage a single war." That old Prussian monarch was no fool. We, however, are prepared to say, comparing our position with that of the monarch, that we can wage war because the masses know what they are fighting for; and they want to fight notwithstanding the incredible burdens—burdens, I repeat, far greater than under tsarism—knowing that they are making these desperate and incredibly heavy sacrifices in defence of their socialist cause, fighting side by side with those workers of other countries who are "disintegrating" and are beginning to understand our position.

Some foolish people are shouting about red militarism. These are political crooks who pretend that they believe this absurdity and throw charges of this kind right and left, exercising their lawyers' skill in concocting plausible arguments and in throwing dust in the eyes of the masses. And the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries shout: "Look, instead of socialism, they are giving you red militarism!"

What a "horrible" crime, indeed! The imperialists of the whole world hurled themselves upon the Russian Republic in order to crush it, and we began to form an army which for the first time in history knows what it is fighting for and what it is making sacrifices for, which is successfully contending against a numerically superior enemy, and which with every month of its resistance on an unprecedented scale is bringing nearer the world revolution, and this is denounced as red militarism!

I repeat, these are either fools to whom no political appraisal can apply, or else political crooks.

Everybody knows that this war was forced upon us. We brought the old war to a close at the beginning of 1918, and did not start a new war. Everybody knows that the whiteguards attacked us in the West, South and East, only because they were assisted by the Entente, which scattered millions right and left. And these advanced countries collected and handed over to the whiteguards the vast stocks of war supplies and ammunition left over from the imperialist war, for those gentlemen, the millionaires and multimillionaires, know that their fate is being decided here, that it is here they will perish if they do not crush us at once.

The socialist republic is straining every nerve, is making sacrifices and winning victories. And if after a year of civil war you look at the map and compare what Soviet Russia was in March 1918 and in July 1918—when the German imperialists in the West occupied the line laid down by the Treaty of Brest, when the Ukraine was under the heel of the German imperialists, when the Czechoslovaks, bribed by the French and British, lorded it in the East as far as Kazan and Simbirsk—if you look at the map today, you will see that we have expanded immensely, that we have won enormous victories.

In this situation, only sordid and despicable political crooks can use strong language and accuse us of red militarism.

Never in history has there been a revolution in which it was possible to lay down one's arms and rest on one's laurels after the victory. Whoever thinks that such revolutions are possible is not only no revolutionary, but the worst enemy of the working class. There has never been a revolution, even a second-rate one, even a bourgeois revolution in which the only issue was the transfer of power from one propertied minority to another. We know of examples! The French revolution, against which the old powers hurled themselves at the beginning of the nineteenth century in order to crush it, we call great precisely because it succeeded in rousing the vast masses of the people in defence of its gains and they resisted the whole world; this was one of its greatest merits.

Revolutions are subjected to the most serious tests in the fire of battle. If you are oppressed and exploited and think of throwing off the power of the exploiters, if you are deter

mined to carry this to its logical conclusion, you must understand that you will have to contend against the onslaught of the exploiters of the whole world. If you are ready to offer resistance and to make further sacrifices in order to hold out in the struggle, you are a revolutionary; if not, you will be crushed.

This is how the question is presented by the history of all revolutions.

The real test to which our revolution is being subjected is that we, in a backward country, succeeded in capturing power before the others, succeeded in establishing the Soviet form of government, the power of the working and exploited people. Shall we be able to hold on at least until the masses in the other countries make a move? If we are not prepared to make fresh sacrifices and do not hold out, it will be said that our revolution was historically unjustified. But democrats in civilised countries who are armed to the teeth dread the presence of a hundred or so Bolsheviks in a free republic with a hundred million population, in the way America does. Bolshevism is so infectious! And it turns out that the democrats cannot cope with a hundred immigrants from starving, ruined Russia who might talk about Bolshevism! The masses sympathise with us! The bourgeoisie have only one path of salvation, and that is, while their hand still grasps the sword, while they still control the guns, to turn these guns against Soviet Russia and to crush her in a few months, because later on nothing will crush her. This is the situation we are in; this is what determined the military policy of the Council of People's Commissars during the past year; and this is why, pointing to the facts, to the results, we have a right to say that we have stood the test only because the workers and peasants, though utterly exhausted by war, are creating a new army under still more arduous conditions and are displaying new heroism.

That is a brief summary of the policy of the Soviet government in the military field. Permit me to say just a few more words about a matter in which military policy overlaps policy in another field—economic policy. I refer to the military experts.

You are probably aware of the controversy that has arisen over this question, and that some comrades, most devoted and

convinced Bolshevik Communists, often expressed vehement protests against the fact that for the purpose of organising our socialist Red Army we are utilising the services of the old military experts, tsarist generals and officers, whose records are blemished by their service to the tsar, and in some cases by the bloody acts of repression against workers and peasants.

The contradiction here is glaring, and indignation, one might say, springs up of its own accord. How can we build a socialist army with the aid of tsarist experts?!

It turned out that this was the way, the only way, we did build up an army. If we give some thought to the task that has fallen to our lot, it will not be difficult to understand that it is the only way we could build it. This is not only a military matter, it is a task that confronts us in all spheres of everyday life, and of the country's economy.

The old utopian socialists imagined that socialism could be built by men of a new type, that first they would train good, pure and splendidly educated people, and these would build socialism. We always laughed at this and said that this was playing with puppets, that it was socialism as an amusement for young ladies, but not serious politics.

We want to build socialism with the aid of those men and women who grew up under capitalism, were depraved and corrupted by capitalism, but steeled for the struggle by capitalism. There are proletarians who have been so hardened that they can stand a thousand times more hardship than any army. There are tens of millions of oppressed peasants, ignorant and scattered, but capable of uniting around the proletariat in the struggle, if the proletariat adopts skilful tactics. And there are scientific and technical experts all thoroughly imbued with the bourgeois world outlook, there are military experts who were trained under bourgeois conditions—if they were only bourgeois it would not be so bad, but there were also conditions of landed proprietorship, serfdom and the big stick. As far as concerns the economy, all the agronomists, engineers and school-teachers were recruited from the propertied class; they did not drop from the skies. Neither under the reign of Tsar Nicholas nor under the Republican President Wilson were the propertyless proletarians at the bench and the peasants at the plough able to get a

university education. Science and technology exist only for the rich, for the propertied class; capitalism provides culture only for the minority. We must build socialism out of this culture, we have no other material. We want to start building socialism at once out of the material that capitalism left us yesterday to be used today, at this very moment, and not with people reared in hothouses, assuming that we were to take this fairy-tale seriously. We have bourgeois experts and nothing else. We have no other bricks with which to build. Socialism must triumph, and we socialists and Communists must prove by deeds that we are capable of building socialism with these bricks, with this material, that we are capable of building socialist society with the aid of proletarians who have enjoyed the fruits of culture only to an insignificant degree, and with the aid of bourgeois specialists.

If you do not build communist society with this material, you will prove that you are mere phrase-mongers and wind-bags.

This is how the question is presented by the historical legacy of world capitalism! This is the difficulty that confronted us concretely when we took power, when we set up the Soviet machinery of state!

This is only half the task, but it is the greater half. Soviet machinery of state means that the working people are united in such a way as to crush capitalism by the weight of their mass unity. The masses did this. But it is not enough to crush capitalism. We must take the entire culture that capitalism left behind and build socialism with it. We must take all its science, technology, knowledge and art. Without these we shall be unable to build communist society. But this science, technology and art are in the hands and in the heads of the experts.

This is the task that confronts us in all spheres. It is a task with inherent contradictions, like the inherent contradictions of capitalism as a whole. It is a most difficult task, but a practicable one. We cannot wait twenty years until we have trained pure, communist experts, until we have trained the first generation of Communists without blemish and without reproach. No, excuse me, but we must build now, in two months and not in twenty years' time, so as to be able to fight the bourgeoisie, to oppose the bourgeois science and

technology of the whole world. Here we must achieve victory. It is difficult to make the bourgeois experts serve us by the weight of our masses, but it is possible, and if we do it, we shall triumph.

When Comrade Trotsky informed me recently that the number of officers of the old army employed by our War Department runs into several tens of thousands, I perceived concretely where the secret of using our enemy lay, how to compel those who had opposed communism to build it, how to build communism with the bricks which the capitalists had chosen to hurl against us! We have no other bricks! And so, we must compel the bourgeois experts, under the leadership of the proletariat, to build up our edifice with these bricks. This is what is difficult; but this is the pledge of victory.

Naturally, on this path, which is a new and difficult one, we have made more than a few mistakes; on this path we have met with more than a few reverses. Everybody knows that a certain number of experts have systematically betrayed us. Among the experts in the factories, among the agronomists, and in the administration, we have seen and see today at every step a malicious attitude to work, malicious sabotage.

We know that all this presents tremendous difficulties and that we cannot achieve victory by violence alone.... We, of course, are not opposed to violence. We laugh at those who are opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat, we laugh and say that they are fools who do not understand that there must be either the dictatorship of the proletariat or the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Those who think otherwise are either idiots, or are so politically ignorant that it would be a disgrace to allow them to come anywhere near a meeting, let alone on the platform. The only alternative is either violence against Liebknecht and Luxemburg, the murder of the best leaders of the workers, or the violent suppression of the exploiters; and whoever dreams of a middle course is our most harmful and dangerous enemy. That is how the matter stands at present. Hence, when we talk of utilising the services of the experts we must bear in mind the lesson taught by Soviet policy during the past year. During that year we have broken and defeated the exploiters and we must now solve the prob-

lem of using the bourgeois specialists. Here, I repeat, violence alone will get us nowhere. Here, in addition to violence, after successful violence, we need the organisation, discipline and moral weight of the victorious proletariat, which will subordinate all the bourgeois experts to its will and draw them into its work.

Some people may say that Lenin is recommending moral persuasion instead of violence! But it is foolish to imagine that we can solve the problem of organising a new science and technology for the development of communist society by violence alone. That is nonsense! We, as a Party, as people who have learned something during this year of Soviet activity, will not be so foolish as to think so, and we will warn the masses not to think so. The employment of all the institutions of bourgeois capitalist society requires not only the successful use of violence, but also organisation, discipline, comradely discipline among the masses, the organisation of proletarian influence over the rest of the population, the creation of a new, mass environment, which will convince the bourgeois specialists that they have no alternative, that there can be no return to the old society, and that they can do their work only in conjunction with the Communists who are working by their side, who are leading the masses, who enjoy the absolute confidence of the masses, and whose object is to ensure that the fruits of bourgeois science and technology, the fruits of thousands of years of the development of civilisation, shall be enjoyed not by a handful of people for the purpose of distinguishing themselves and amassing wealth, but by literally all the working people.

This is an immensely difficult task, the fulfilment of which will require decades! But to carry it out we must create a force, a discipline, comradely discipline, Soviet discipline, proletarian discipline, such as will not only physically crush the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, but also encompass them completely, subordinate them to our will, compel them to proceed along our lines, to serve our cause.

I repeat that we come up against this problem every day in the work of organising our military forces, in the work of economic development, in the work of every economic council, in the work of every factory committee and of every nationalised factory. There was hardly a week during all

past year that the Council of People's Commissars did not discuss and settle this question in one way or another. I am sure that there was not a single factory committee in Russia, not a single agricultural commune, not a single state farm, not a single uyezd land department which did not come up against this issue scores of times in the course of the past year's Soviet activity.

This is what makes this task so difficult, but it is also what makes it a really gratifying one. This is what we must do now, the day after the exploiters were crushed by the force of the proletarian insurrection. We suppressed their resistance—this had to be done. But this is not the only thing that has to be done. By the force of the new organisation, the comradely organisation of the working people, we must compel them to serve us. We must cure them of their old vices and prevent them from relapsing into their exploiting practices. They have remained bourgeois, and they occupy posts as commanders and staff officers in our army, as engineers and agronomists, and these old, bourgeois people call themselves Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. It does not matter what they call themselves. They are bourgeois through and through, from head to foot, in their outlook and in their habits.

Well, what shall we do, throw them out? You cannot throw out hundreds of thousands! And if we did we should be harming only ourselves. We have no other material with which to build communism than that created by capitalism. We must not throw them out, but break their resistance, watch them at every step, make no political concessions to them, which spineless people are inclined to do every minute. Educated people yield to the policy and influence of the bourgeoisie because they acquired all their education in a bourgeois environment and from that environment. That is why they stumble at every step and make political concessions to the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

A Communist who says that he must not get into a state where he will soil his hands, that he must have clean, communist hands, and that he will build communist society with clean communist hands and scorn the services of the contemptible, counter-revolutionary bourgeois co-operators, is a mere phrase-monger, because we cannot help resorting to their services.

The practical task that confronts us now is to enlist the services of all those whom capitalism has trained to oppose us, to watch them day after day, to place worker commissars over them in an environment of communist organisation, day after day to thwart their counter-revolutionary designs, and at the same time to learn from them.

The science which we, at best, possess, is the science of the agitator and propagandist, of the man who has been steeled by the hellishly hard lot of the factory worker, or starving peasant, a science which teaches us how to hold out for a long time and to persevere in the struggle, and this has saved us up to now. All this is necessary, but it is not enough. With this alone we cannot triumph. In order that our victory may be complete and final we must take all that is valuable from capitalism, take all its science and culture.

How can we take it? We must learn from them, from our enemies. Our advanced peasants, the class-conscious workers in their factories, our officials in the uyezds land departments must learn from the bourgeois agronomists, engineers, and others, so as to acquire the fruits of their culture.

In this respect, the struggle that flared up in our Party during the past year was extremely useful. It gave rise to numerous sharp collisions, but there are no struggles without sharp collisions. As a result, however, we gained practical experience in a matter that had never before confronted us, but without which it is impossible to achieve communism. I say again that the task of combining the victorious proletarian revolution with bourgeois culture, with bourgeois science and technology, which up to now has been available to few people, is a difficult one. Here, everything depends on the organisation and discipline of the advanced sections of the working people. If, in Russia, the millions of downtrodden and ignorant peasants who are totally incapable of independent development, who were oppressed by the landowners for centuries, did not have at their head, and by their side, an advanced section of the urban workers whom they understood, with whom they were intimate, who enjoyed their confidence, whom they believed as fellow-workers, if there were not this organisation which is capable of rallying the masses of the working people, of influencing them, of explaining to them and convincing them of the importance of the

task of taking over the entire bourgeois culture, the cause of communism would be hopeless.

I say this not from the abstract point of view, but from the point of view of a whole year's daily experience. Although this experience includes a multitude of petty details, sometimes dull and unpleasant, we must learn to see something deeper in them. We must understand that these petty details, these conflicts between, say, a factory committee and an engineer, a Red Army man and some bourgeois officer, a peasant and a bourgeois agronomist—these conflicts, this friction, these petty details contain much that is immeasurably deeper. We have vanquished the prejudice that these bourgeois specialists should be thrown out. We have taken over this machine, it is still running badly, we have no illusions on that score; it keeps stopping, it makes mistakes all the time, it runs into ditches, and we drag it out again, but it is moving, and we shall keep it on the right road. This is the only way we can emerge from this quagmire of destruction, frightful difficulties, ruin, barbarism, poverty and starvation into which we were dragged by the war, and into which the imperialists of all countries are trying to push us and keep us.

But we have begun to emerge, the first steps have been taken.

This year of Soviet activity has taught us clearly to understand the task in every individual case of work in the factories and among the peasants, and we have mastered it. Soviet power has gained tremendously by it in the past year, and it has been worth while spending a year on it. We shall not, as we did in the old days, discuss theoretically and in general terms the importance of bourgeois specialists and the importance of proletarian organisations, but at every step, in every factory committee, and in every land organisation, we shall make use of the experience we have gained. We have laid the foundation of our Red Army, we now have a small foundation, we now have nationalised factories where the workers understand their tasks and have begun to increase labour productivity with the aid of bourgeois specialists (who at every step are trying to return to the past while the mass organisations of the workers are compelling them to march forward in step with Soviet power)—all this is a great gain for Soviet power. This work is imperceptible, there is

nothing brilliant about it, it is difficult to appraise its real value, but the very fact that from simply suppressing the exploiters we have advanced to a phase where we are learning ourselves and teaching the masses how to build communism with capitalist bricks and compel the capitalist bourgeois specialists to work for us, is a step forward for our movement. Only on this road shall we achieve victory. And now we know that if we proceed as we have been up to now we shall really achieve this victory.

Comrades, I now come to the last question that I want to deal with, if only briefly, for I have already spoken too long. I have in mind the question of our relations with the countryside.

Up to now I have spoken about our activities in the military field, about the dictatorship, and about utilising the services of bourgeois specialists. Now I want to deal with another great difficulty that we encounter in our work of communist construction.

What is to be done if the proletariat has taken power in a country where the urban proletariat constitutes a minority of the population, while the majority are peasants accustomed to work individually and deeply imbued with habits of individual farming?

The majority of these peasants, however, have been so ruined, impoverished and exhausted by the oppression of the landowners and capitalists that they willingly render assistance to the proletariat. When an urban worker approaches a peasant in a reasonable way, tactfully, as man to man, and not as if he wants to be a boss, which arouses legitimate hatred, he wins the peasant's most comradely confidence and complete support. We know that this is a fact, and Soviet power in the villages is based on it. Soviet power has been able to hold out only because it has been receiving the sincere support of the majority of the working people. We have been receiving this support because the urban workers have established contact with the rural poor in thousands of ways, of which we have not even an inkling.

The state, which formerly hindered the establishment of such contacts, is now doing all it can to facilitate it. This alone explains why Soviet power has been able to hold out and this is the sole pledge of victory.

The enormous difficulties I have just referred to are due to the peasants being accustomed to work individually and to sell their grain freely. They think this is quite legitimate. They argue as follows. How can it be that having worked so hard to produce grain at the cost of so much sweat and blood, we have no right to sell it as we please? The peasants consider themselves the injured party.

But we know from the entire development of Russia that freedom to trade means freely breeding capitalists; and freedom to trade in a country which has been exhausted by starvation, where starving people are prepared to give anything, even to sell themselves into slavery, for a crust of bread, freedom to trade when the country is starving means allowing the minority freely to amass wealth and ruin the majority.

We must prove that help for the peasantry is a primary task in a country which has been exhausted by starvation; but we can help the peasantry only by uniting their activities, by uniting the masses, for the peasants are scattered, disunited and accustomed to work and live out of contact with one another.

There are no objective obstacles to the fulfilment of this difficult task. All that had to be done by means of force, has been done; we do not reject force, for we know that there are kulaks among the peasants who are actively resisting us and go to the length of organising whiteguard revolts. This, however, does not apply to peasants in the mass. The kulaks are a minority. As far as they are concerned, the only thing to do is to fight them and to keep on fighting them. They must be crushed, and we are crushing them. But after the successful fulfilment of the task of crushing the rural exploiters problems arise which cannot be solved by the use of force. In this sphere, as in all the others, we can fulfil our task only by means of mass organisation, by means of the prolonged educational influence of the urban proletariat over the peasantry.

Shall we succeed in this task? Yes, we know from experience that we shall, and only because the vast majority of the peasants have confidence in the workers' government and on the basis of this confidence in the workers we can reinforce the foundation we have begun to build, and which we must

continue to build, but only by means of comradely influence and discipline.

This is the practical task that now confronts us.

When we established the Poor Peasants' Committees,¹⁶ when we tried to introduce barter with the rural districts, we did so not to enable the rich peasants to obtain goods, but primarily to enable the poor peasants to obtain the small quantities of goods that the cities could provide so that by helping the poor we would be able with their aid to beat the kulaks and take their surplus grain.

It has been an extremely difficult task to supply grain to the population of a vast country with poor transport facilities and a scattered peasantry, and it has given us the most trouble. I recall all the meetings of the Council of People's Commissars and must say that the Soviet government has not worked so persistently on anything as it has on this. Our peasants are extremely scattered and disunited. In the rural districts ignorance and the habit of working individually are more deep rooted than anywhere. The rural population is dissatisfied with not being allowed freedom to trade in grain. And in this situation, of course, political crooks, all sorts of Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, incite the peasantry by saying to them, "They are robbing you!"

There are scoundrels who after a year of Soviet activity, when, incidentally, food supply authorities have shown that during the past few months we supplied the rural districts with 42,000 carloads of goods and received in exchange only 39,000 carloads of grain—there are scoundrels, I say, who, after this come along and yell, "Peasants, the Soviet government is robbing you!"

At a time when the workers in the towns are on the verge of exhaustion—and nowhere is there such terrible hunger as in the towns and in the non-agricultural parts of Russia—when the peasants have taken all the land and grain that belonged to landowners, and when the bulk of the peasants, as we know, in the first year of Soviet power worked for themselves and not for the landowners and merchants and are now feeding better than they did before, when the population of the urban and non-agricultural districts of the country is starving and all the capitalists are trying to crush us by famine, at such a time people wearing Menshevik, Socialist-

Revolutionary, or other clownish costumes, have the insolence to shout, "They are robbing you!" These people are agents of capitalism, and we must treat them as such and nothing else!

At a time when the main difficulty confronting the Soviet government is the famine, it is the duty of every Soviet citizen to hand over all his surplus grain to the famine-stricken. This is so clear and obvious, so intelligible to every working man, that nobody can say a word against it. One must be a scoundrel, a political crook, to obscure this plain, clear and obvious truth, to make it unintelligible, or distort it!

It is on this truth that the urban workers rely. It is because this truth is so obvious that they are able to do their extremely difficult job. Up to now they have told the poor peasants that they and the workers constitute the real bulwark of Soviet power, that is why the working class has established Poor Peasants' Committees, organised barter, and made it obligatory for the co-operatives to include the whole population. All the decrees on agriculture issued up to now have this main idea running through them. And in all our appeals to the urban workers we have said, "Unite with the rural poor, for unless you do, you will be unable to solve the most important and most difficult problem, namely, the bread problem." And to the peasants we said, "Either you unite with the urban workers, in which case we shall triumph; or you allow yourselves to be misled by the admonitions and exhortations of the capitalists and their servants and flunkeys in Menshevik garb, who say, 'Don't let the towns rob you, trade as you please, the rich get richer, what do you care if people are dying of starvation', in which case you yourselves will perish, you will become the slaves of the capitalists and cause the ruin of Soviet Russia." It was only under capitalism that people argued, "I shall trade, I shall get rich. Every man for himself and God for all." This was the principle of capitalism and it engendered war; that is why the workers and peasants were poor, and an insignificant number of people became multimillionaires.

The problem is how to approach the peasants in the course of practical work, how to organise the poor and middle peasants so as to be able at every step to combat their gravita-

tion towards the past, their attempts to go back to free trading activities, their constant striving to be "free" producers. The word "freedom" is a good word. We meet it at every step: freedom to trade, freedom to sell, freedom to sell oneself, and so forth. And there are Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, rascals, who garble and distort this beautiful word "freedom" in every newspaper and in every speech. But these are all crooks, capitalism's prostitutes, who are trying to drag the people back to the past.

Lastly, the main object of the attention and activities of the Council of People's Commissars as well as of the Council of Defence has recently, during the past few months and weeks, been the fight against the famine.

The famine is particularly disastrous for us at the present time, on the threshold of the spring; and the spring threatens to be a most severe period for us. Just as last year the most severe period was the end of winter, the spring and the beginning of the summer, so, this year, we are now on the threshold of a severe period. The whiteguards, landowners and capitalists have greater hopes of being able to play on the famine as a means of crushing Soviet power since they have been unable to do it in open struggle.

The people who call themselves Mensheviks and Right or Left Socialist-Revolutionaries have sunk so low that they claim to side with the working people but when the food situation becomes more acute and famine is approaching they try to take advantage of it and incite the masses of the people against the workers' and peasants' government. They do not understand that this sort of policy today, this incitement and these attempts by the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries to make capital out of the famine, ostensibly for the benefit of the workers, are direct assistance to the whiteguards, just as much as was the treachery of the Left Socialist-Revolutionary Muravyov on the Eastern Front last year, which cost the lives of tens of thousands of workers and peasants. Any such agitation costs thousands more lives in the war against the whiteguards. When Muravyov committed his act of treachery last year, he opened up almost the entire front to the enemy and caused us a number of severe reverses.

That is why I should like primarily and mainly to deal very briefly with the major facts.

Although today our food situation has become worse, just as it did last spring, we have every hope that we shall not only overcome this difficulty but shall cope with it better than we did last year. This hope is based on the fact that the situation in the East and South has greatly improved; and the East and South are the main granaries of Russia. At a number of meetings of the Council of Defence and the Council of People's Commissars held during the past few days we ascertained very definitely that about nine million poods of grain have been piled up on the railways between Kazan and Saratov, and on the Volga-Bugulma line, to the east of Samara, across the Volga.

The great difficulty, and great danger, is that our railways are in such a state of disrepair, and the shortage of locomotives is so considerable, that we are not sure of being able to move all this grain. This is what we have concentrated our main attention and activities on during the past few days, and that is why we resolved to resort to a measure like the suspension of all passenger traffic from March 18 to April 10.

We know that this is a harsh measure. Agitators who are helping the whiteguards will no doubt come along and shout, "Look, the people are starving, and yet passenger traffic has been stopped, to make it impossible to carry grain." Agitators of this type will certainly appear. But we tell ourselves that in all cases of difficulty we rely on the class-consciousness of the honest workers, and they will side with us.

According to the calculations of the experts, the suspension of passenger traffic will release 220 locomotives. These passenger locomotives are less powerful than freight locomotives, they cannot haul as much; but we have estimated that during this period they will be able to haul about three and a half million poods of grain. Individual food profiteers and the starving people who roam all over the country in search of grain, would, at the most, be able to carry half a million poods in such a period. This will be confirmed by every experienced railway worker, by everybody, who has been on the Trans-Volga line and has seen the grain heaped up, sometimes right on the bare snow. The sacks of grain may be damaged; as it is the grain is moist, and the situation will become worse when the spring thaw commences. We therefore resorted to

this harsh measure, convinced that the truth cannot be concealed from the vast masses of the workers, that the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries will not succeed in misleading them, that truth will prevail.

This harsh measure, the suspension of passenger traffic, will provide us with several million poods of grain. We must brush aside the lies, slander and fairy-tales to the effect that it is harmful to suspend passenger traffic and say that with the assistance of the Petrograd, Moscow and Ivanovo-Voznesensk workers who are being sent to the South, it will provide a sufficient quantity of grain. Incidentally, I will remind you that no city has devoted so much effort to the organisation of food supplies as Petrograd. All the best forces in that city have already been mustered for the work, and this is what the workers in the other advanced cities should do, too.

The socialist revolution cannot be accomplished without the working class. It cannot be accomplished if the working class has not accumulated sufficient forces to be able to lead the tens of millions of exhausted, illiterate, and scattered rural people who had been crushed by capitalism. Only the advanced workers can lead them. But our best forces have already been used up, they are weary and exhausted. Their places must be taken by average people and young forces. Probably they will make mistakes, but that does not matter so long as they are devoted to the workers' cause, and so long as they have been brought up in the environment of the proletarian struggle.

We have already taken measures to send our best forces to the Volga-Bugulma Railway. Comrade Bryukhanov has gone there accompanied by a group of workers. Army detachments accompanied by workers have been sent to other lines, too, and, I repeat, there are good grounds for hoping that we shall obtain grain. A severe half-year lies ahead of us, but this will be the last severe half-year, because instead of an enemy who is becoming stronger, we have in front of us an enemy who is disintegrating, for the Soviet movement is growing in all countries.

These are the grounds on which, after discussing the matter most carefully and verifying our calculations again and again, we say that the suspension of passenger traffic will enable us to bring in several million poods of grain and

use the extremely rich granaries of the East and South. In the course of this severe half-year we shall vanquish our chief enemy, the famine. Moreover, our position today is much better than it was last year, because we now have reserves.

Last year the Czechoslovaks reached Kazan and Simbirsk; the Ukraine was under the heel of the Germans; Krasnov, financed by the Germans, was mustering troops in the Don region, and we were cut off from the South. Today the Ukraine is being liberated from the German imperialists. The latter had planned to ship 60,000,000 poods of grain to Germany, but they shipped only 9,000,000 poods, and with it something they cannot digest, namely, Bolshevism. This is what upset the German imperialists, and this is what will upset the French and British imperialists if it becomes possible for them to advance farther into Russia.

We now have a Soviet Ukraine. And when it comes to supplying us with grain, the Soviet Government of the Ukraine will not fix its price like a huckster, a profiteer, or a muzhik who says, "The starving will give me a 1,000 rubles a pood. To hell with the state monopoly. All I want is to get rich. If the people are starving, all the better, they will pay more." This is the way the rural bourgeoisie, the kulaks, the profiteers argue, and they are being assisted by all those who agitate against the state grain monopoly, by those who stand for "freedom" to trade, that is, freedom for the rich muzhik to amass wealth, and freedom for the workers who are getting nothing to starve to death. But the Ukrainian Government said, "Our first task is to help the starving North. The Ukraine cannot hold out if the North, which is exhausted by famine, does not hold out. The Ukraine will hold out, and her victory will be certain, if she helps the starving North."

In the Ukraine there are huge stocks of grain. We cannot ship it all at once. We have sent our best Soviet forces to the Ukraine and already they all report in one voice that the stocks of grain are enormous, but they cannot be dispatched all at once, we haven't the machinery for it. The Germans devastated the Ukraine to such a degree that the machinery of administration must be built entirely anew, and this has only just begun. Complete chaos reigns there. The worst period, the first weeks at Smolny after the October Revolu-

tion when we were trying to overcome the chaos, was nothing compared with the difficulties that are now being experienced in the Ukraine. The Ukrainian comrades are complaining bitterly about the lack of people, lack of forces with which to build up the Soviet government. They have no machinery of administration, they have no proletarian centre like Petrograd or Moscow, for the Ukrainian proletarian centres are occupied by the enemy. Kiev is not a proletarian centre. The Donets Basin, exhausted by starvation, has not yet been liberated from the Cossacks. Our Ukrainian comrades cry, "Workers of the North, come to our assistance!"

And that is why we, on behalf of the Ukrainian comrades, say to the Petrograd workers, knowing that they have done more than the workers of any other city, "Do a little more, make another effort!" Now we can and must come to the aid of our Ukrainian comrades, because they must build up the machinery of the Soviet state on a site that was cleared and laid waste by suffering as no other place has been!

We discussed the situation in the Central Committee of our Party and gave instructions that everything should first be done to help to build up administrative machinery in the Ukraine, and in return for this, when this machinery is available, to set to work to obtain 50,000,000 poods of grain by June 1.

I do not in the least wish to assert that this will be done. We all know that of all the tasks we undertook, not one was fulfilled by the appointed date. Suppose only part of this task is fulfilled; at all events you will know definitely that when things get worse, when the famine here becomes more acute, and when the food supply machinery will be working at top speed in the East and South, we shall be able to obtain urgent aid from the South and improve our situation.

In addition to the Ukraine, we have another source of grain supply—the Don region. There, the victories of the Red Army have already worked miracles. Several weeks ago the situation on the Don, in the war against Krasnov, against our main enemy, against the officers and Cossacks who received millions in bribes, first from the Germans and then from the British and French, who are still continuing to help them—several weeks ago, our position was very serious. But now we have, with tremendous speed, regained territory

not only up to Tsaritsyn, but farther to the south. The forces of Krasnov and the Don counter-revolutionaries have been broken in spite of the assistance they received from the imperialists.

What does this mean? It means that we are getting nearer to coal and grain, for the lack of which we are perishing—owing to the shortage of coal, the railways and factories are coming to a standstill, and owing to the shortage of grain, the workers in the towns, and in the non-agricultural districts generally, are suffering the pangs of starvation.

In the Don area, as in the Ukraine, the grain stocks are enormous. Furthermore, it cannot be said that there is no administrative machinery in the Don area. In every military unit there is a Communist group, worker commissars, and groups of food supply workers. The greatest difficulty there is that neither of the two main railway lines can be used because the whiteguards, on retreating, blew up the bridges.

The last meeting of the Council of Defence and the Council of People's Commissars was attended by experts whom we asked how material could be obtained to repair the lines, and how at least one of them could be repaired. At the last meeting of the Council of Defence we were able to assure ourselves that thanks to an enormous exertion of effort not only were materials provided, but the comrades on the spot assured us, almost guaranteed, that both lines would be repaired before the spring thaw. The resumption of traffic on these two lines is perhaps worth many victories over the Cossacks and enables us to say that we must hold on for another few severe months, we must strain every nerve, obtain the assistance of the Petrograd, Moscow and Ivanov-Voznesensk workers. In addition to the East, from where it is difficult to ship anything, in addition to the Ukraine, where there are vast stocks but no administrative machinery, we have the Don region, which has been reconquered by the Red Army. That is why we cautiously, after cool calculation, after verifying all this by means of repeated reports and communications from the people on the spot and hearing the statements of food supply and railway experts, say that we have very good grounds for believing that we can not only hold out as we held out last year, but also greatly improve our conditions.

Our internal enemy is collapsing, and our external enemy cannot possibly hold out for long. Comrades, we were particularly convinced of this by what we heard from our foreign comrades who arrived here, and jointly with whom we recently formed the Communist International in Moscow. In Paris, speakers at public meetings who attack Bolshevism are driven from the platform. Yes, victory will be ours! The imperialists may yet shed the blood of thousands and thousands of workers, murder Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, and hundreds of the best representatives of the International, they may fill the prisons in Britain, France, Germany and Italy with socialists, but this will not avail them! Victory will be ours! For in spite of all the lies and the torrents of abuse and filthy slander that are poured out against us, the workers of all countries now understand what is meant by Soviets, by Soviet power. The capitalists of no country have a way out. I repeat that when they conclude peace they will be at loggerheads. France is ready to hurl herself upon Italy, they are quarrelling over the division of the booty. Japan is arming against America. They have imposed upon the peoples an incredible burden of tribute, millions upon millions of war debts. But everywhere the people are exhausted by war, everywhere there is a shortage of food, industry is at a standstill, and starvation reigns. The Entente, which is promising right and left to help the counter-revolutionaries, cannot feed its own countries. The masses of the workers in Paris, in London and in New York have translated the word "Soviet" into their own languages, they have made it intelligible for every worker, for they know that the old bourgeois republic cannot help their cause, that only a workers' government can help them.

Soviet Russia encounters enormous difficulties because the military forces of the most well-armed and most powerful countries of the world have been hurled against her. In spite of this, Soviet power in Russia has succeeded in winning the sympathy, the attention and moral support of the workers of the world. And on the basis of these facts, not exaggerating in the least, and not shutting our eyes to the fact that in Germany and in other countries workers' blood is flowing and many of the best socialist leaders are being brutally done to death—we know this and do not shut our eyes to it—we

assert that victory, complete victory, will be ours, because the power of the imperialists in the other countries has been shaken, while the workers are emerging from their state of stultification and deception. Soviet power has already won recognition from the workers of all countries. Everywhere the Soviets, the capture of power by the workers themselves, are regarded as the only hope.

And when the workers learn that the united workers even in an underdeveloped and backward country, after capturing power, have succeeded in creating a force that is resisting the imperialists of the whole world, when they learn that these workers have succeeded in taking the factories from the capitalists and in giving to the peasants the land that formerly belonged to the landowners—when this truth reaches the masses of workers of all countries, we shall be able once again to say loudly, and with firm conviction, that our victory on a world scale is assured, for the power of the bourgeoisie has been shaken, it will no longer succeed in deceiving the workers, for the Soviet movement has sprung up everywhere. And just as we saw the birth of the Soviet Republic on October 25, 1917, and the birth of the Third, Communist International a few days ago in Moscow, so we shall soon see the birth of a World Soviet Republic. *(The speech was interrupted by applause, and ended in an ovation.)*

I should very much like the Petrograd comrades to print the following as a *foreword* or *afterword* to my speech, even if only in small type.

April 17

Lenin

AFTERWORD 17

After spending no little effort in correcting the verbatim report of my speech, I am compelled to make the following urgent request to all comrades who want to report my speeches for the press.

My request is that they should never rely on the shorthand or any other verbatim reports of my speeches, never

make any endeavour to obtain such reports, and never publish such reports of my speeches.

Instead of publishing the shorthand reports of my speeches let them, if necessary, publish summaries of them. I have seen newspaper summaries of my speeches that were satisfactory; but I have never seen a single verbatim report of my speeches that was at all satisfactory. Whether this is due to the fact that I speak too fast, or that I do not construct my sentences properly, or to some other reason, I will not undertake to say; but the fact remains that I have never seen a single satisfactory shorthand, or any other verbatim report of my speeches.

A good summary of a speech is better than a bad verbatim report. That is why I request that no verbatim report of my speeches should ever be published.

April 17, 1919

N. Lenin

**SPEECH IN MEMORY OF Y. M. SVERDLOV
AT A SPECIAL SESSION
OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MARCH 18, 1919**

Comrades, today, when the workers of all countries are honouring the memory of the heroic rise and tragic end of the Paris Commune we have to inter the remains of Yakov Mikhailovich Sverdlov. In the course of our revolution, and in its victories, Comrade Sverdlov succeeded in expressing more fully and integrally than anybody else the chief and most important features of the proletarian revolution, and this, even more than his boundless devotion to the cause of the revolution, made him significant as a leader of the proletarian revolution.

Comrades, people who judge by what they see on the surface, the numerous enemies of our revolution, and those who to this day vacillate between the revolution and its opponents, consider the most striking feature of our revolution to be the determined and relentlessly firm way it has dealt with the exploiters and the enemies of the working people. There is no doubt that without this, without revolutionary violence, the proletariat could not have triumphed. Nor can there be any doubt that revolutionary violence was a necessary and legitimate weapon of the revolution only at definite stages of its development, only under definite and special conditions, and that a far more profound and permanent feature of this revolution and condition of its victory was, and remains, the organisation of the proletarian masses, the organisation of the working people.

And it is this organisation of millions of working people that constitutes the best stimulant for the revolution, its deepest source of victory. And it is this feature of the proletarian revolution which, in the course of the struggle, brought to the fore those leaders who best expressed that specific feature of our revolution that was never seen in revolutions before, namely, the organisation of the masses. This feature of the proletarian revolution also brought to the fore Yakov Sverdlov, a man who was first and foremost an organiser.

Comrades, we Russian revolutionaries, particularly in the stern days of the prolonged, sometimes painful and excessively long period of preparation for the revolution, suffered because of the gulf between theory, principle and programme and our practical work. We suffered most of all from a too deep engrossment in theory divorced from direct action.

The history of the Russian revolutionary movement over a period of many decades contains a list of martyrs who were devoted to the revolutionary cause, but who had no opportunity to put their revolutionary ideals into practice. In this respect, the proletarian revolution, for the first time, provided these formerly isolated heroes of the revolutionary struggle with real ground, a real basis, a real environment, a real audience, and a real proletarian army in which they could display their talents. And in this respect, the most outstanding leaders are those who, as practical, efficient organisers, have succeeded in winning for themselves an exceptionally prominent place such as Yakov Sverdlov won for himself and rightly occupied.

If we survey the life of this leader of the proletarian revolution we see that his wonderful organising talents developed in the course of long struggle. We see that this leader of the proletarian revolution himself cultivated every one of his wonderful gifts as a great revolutionary who had passed through and experienced different epochs in the severest conditions of revolutionary activity. He dedicated himself entirely to the revolution in the very first period of his activities, when still a youth who had barely acquired political consciousness. In that period, at the very beginning of the twentieth century, Comrade Sverdlov stood before

us as the most perfect type of professional revolutionary, a man who had entirely given up his family and all the comforts and habits of the old bourgeois society, a man who devoted himself heart and soul to the revolution, and who for many years, even decades, passing from prison to exile and from exile to prison, cultivated those characteristics which steeled revolutionaries for many, many years.

However, this professional revolutionary never, not even for a moment, lost contact with the masses. Although the conditions of tsarism condemned him, like all the revolutionaries of those days, mainly to underground, illegal activities, even then, even in those underground and illegal activities, Sverdlov always marched shoulder to shoulder and hand in hand with the advanced workers who, at the beginning of the twentieth century, began to take the place of the earlier generation of revolutionary intellectuals.

It was at this time that scores and hundreds of advanced workers took up activities and acquired that steel-like hardness in the revolutionary struggle which, together with the closest contact with the masses, made it possible to bring about a successful proletarian revolution in Russia. It is precisely this long period of illegal activity that most of all characterises the man who was constantly in the fight, who never lost contact with the masses, who never left Russia, who always worked in conjunction with the best of the workers, and who, in spite of the isolation from general life to which persecution condemned the revolutionary, succeeded in becoming not only a beloved leader of the workers, not only a leader who was most familiar with practical work, but also an organiser of the advanced proletarians. Some people were of the opinion—and this applies mostly to our opponents, or to the waverers—that this complete absorption in illegal activities, this specific feature of the professional revolutionary, cut him off from the masses. But the revolutionary activities of Yakov Sverdlov prove to us how utterly mistaken this opinion was, that, on the contrary, this boundless devotion to the revolutionary cause, which is typical of the lives of people who had seen the inside of many prisons and had been in exile in the remotest regions of Siberia, produced such leaders, the flower of our

proletariat. And when this was combined with a knowledge of men and organisational ability, it produced great organisers. The illegal circles, revolutionary underground work, the illegal Party, which nobody personified or expressed so integrally as Yakov Sverdlov—this was the practical school through which he passed, and the only school that could have enabled him to reach the position of the first man in the first socialist Soviet Republic, the position of the first organiser of the broad proletarian masses.

Comrades, all those who, like myself, have had occasion to work with Comrade Sverdlov day after day, had it vividly brought home to them that it was the exceptional organising talent of this man which gave us that which we have been so proud of, so justly proud of, up to now. He made it possible for us to carry on concerted, efficient, really organised activities, activities worthy of the organised proletarian masses, and answering to the requirements of the proletarian revolution—those concerted, organised activities without which we could not have achieved a single success, without which we could not have overcome any one of the innumerable difficulties which we have had to face, and without which we would not have been able to stand up to any one of the severe trials we experienced in the past, and are experiencing at the present time.

In that seething struggle that is revolution, at that special post which every revolutionary occupies, at a time when the work of even a small body of men takes the form of deliberations, of enormous importance is high moral prestige won in the course of the struggle, unquestionable and unchallenged prestige, the roots of which lie, of course, not in abstract morals, but in the morals of the revolutionary fighter, the morals of the rank and file of the revolutionary masses.

The fact that for over a year we have been able to bear the incredible burdens that have fallen to the lot of a narrow circle of devoted revolutionaries, the fact that the leading groups could so firmly, quickly, and unanimously decide the most difficult problems, is due entirely to the prominent place among them occupied by such an exceptionally talented organiser as Yakov Sverdlov. He alone managed to acquire an amazing knowledge of the leading

men of the proletarian movement, he alone, in the course of the long years of struggle—to which I can refer here only very briefly—succeeded in acquiring the wonderful intuition of the practical worker, the wonderful talent of an organiser, an absolutely unchallenged prestige, thanks to which he was able to take sole charge of some of the largest branches of the work of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee which only a group of ordinary people could cope with. He alone succeeded in winning for himself such a position that on a large number of extremely big and important practical questions of organisation, his mere word was sufficient to secure an unchallenged and final settlement, without conferences, without a formal vote; and everybody felt convinced that the questions had been settled on the basis of such profound practical knowledge and organising intuition that not only hundreds and thousands of advanced workers, but also the masses would accept that settlement as final.

History long ago proved that in the course of the struggle great revolutions bring great men to the forefront and develop talents that had previously seemed impossible. Nobody would have believed that the school of the illegal study circle and underground activities, the school of the small, persecuted Party, the school of Turukhansk prison could produce this organiser who won absolutely unchallenged prestige, the organiser of Soviet power throughout Russia, the man, unique in his knowledge, who organised the work of the Party which created the Soviets and established the Soviet government which is now making its arduous, painful, bloody but triumphant advance to all nations, to all countries throughout the world.

We shall never be able to replace this man who had cultivated such an exceptional organising talent, if by replacement we mean finding one man, one comrade, with all these qualities. Nobody who has been close to Yakov Sverdlov and has watched him constantly at work can have any doubt that in this respect he is irreplaceable. The work he performed as an organiser, in choosing men and appointing them to responsible posts in all the various departments, will be performed in future only if we appoint whole groups of men to handle the different major departments that he had

sole charge of, and if these men, following in his footsteps, come near to doing what this one man did alone.

But the proletarian revolution is strong precisely because its roots run deep. We know that it promotes new men to take the place of those who devotedly sacrificed their lives in the struggle, they are perhaps less experienced, possess less knowledge, and are at first less trained, but they are men who have broad contacts with the masses and who are capable of promoting from their ranks groups of men to take the place of the departed geniuses, to continue their cause, to continue along the road they pursued and to complete what they had begun. In this respect we are fully convinced that the proletarian revolution in Russia and all over the world will promote group after group of men, numerous sections of the proletariat and of the working peasantry, which will possess that practical knowledge of life, that organising talent, collective if not individual, without which the million-strong army of the proletariat cannot achieve victory.

The memory of Comrade Yakov Sverdlov will serve not only as a permanent symbol of the revolutionary's devotion to his cause and as the model of how to combine a practical sober mind, practical skill, close contact with the masses and ability to guide them; it is also a pledge that ever-growing numbers of proletarians, guided by these examples, will march forward to the complete victory of the world communist revolution.

Pravda No. 60,
March 20, 1919

Published according to
the verbatim report,
verified with the *Pravda* text

**SPEECH
DELIVERED AT THE FUNERAL
OF YAKOV SVERDLOV
MARCH 18, 1919**

NEWSPAPER REPORT

We have lowered into the grave the remains of a proletarian leader who did more than anybody to organise the working class and to ensure victory. Now that Soviet power is spreading throughout the world and the knowledge is rapidly gaining ground of how the proletariat, organised in Soviets, is struggling to put its ideas into effect, we are burying a representative of the proletariat who set an example of how to fight for these ideas.

Millions of proletarians will repeat our words: "Long live the memory of Comrade Sverdlov. At his graveside we solemnly vow to fight still harder for the overthrow of capital and for the complete emancipation of the working people... ."

Published in *Vecherniye
Izvestia Moskovskogo Soveta*
No. 196, March 19, 1919

Published according to
the newspaper text

DRAFT PROGRAMME OF THE R.C.P.(B.)¹⁸

**Published according to
manuscript and typewritten copies**

1

ROUGH DRAFT OF THE PROGRAMME OF THE R.C.P.

Plan. The programme shall consist of the following sections.

1. Preamble. The proletarian revolution has begun in Russia and is rapidly spreading everywhere. To understand the revolution it is necessary to understand the nature of capitalism and the inevitability of its development towards the dictatorship of the proletariat. 2. Capitalism and the dictatorship of the proletariat. On this point repeat the main section of our old Marxist programme, drawn up by Plekhanov, so as to explain also the "historical roots" of our world outlook. 3. Imperialism. To be taken from the draft programme of May 1917. 4. Three trends in the world working-class movement and the new International. Revision of the draft of May 1917. 5. The fundamental tasks of the proletarian dictatorship in Russia. To be taken from the draft of December 1917-January 1918.¹⁹ 6. These tasks in the political sphere to be formulated concretely (new). 7. Ditto in the national, religious, educational spheres (new). 8. Ditto in economic sphere (new). 9. Ditto in agrarian sphere (new). 10. Ditto as regards protection of the working people (to be written by Schmidt). 11 and 12. To be added on other spheres (not yet written).

Much in this rough draft is unfinished, especially the editorial aspect of it, and in some cases, instead of programme formulations, commentaries have been provisionally taken.

(1) The Revolution of October 25 (November 7), 1917 established the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia which began, with the support of the poor peasantry or semi-proletariat, to build a communist society. The growth

of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in all advanced countries, the universal emergence and development of the Soviet form of that movement, i.e., a form which aims directly at the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and, lastly, the beginning and progress of the revolution in Austria-Hungary and, particularly, in Germany, all goes to show vividly that the era of the world proletarian, communist revolution has begun.

(2) The causes, significance and aims of this revolution can be correctly understood, first, by making clear the real nature, the fundamental character of capitalism and of bourgeois society, and the inevitability of their development towards communism; and secondly, by making clear the nature of imperialism and of imperialist wars, which have accelerated the collapse of capitalism and have placed the proletarian revolution on the order of the day.

* * *

(3) The nature of capitalism and of the bourgeois society which still dominates in most civilised countries and the development of which inevitably leads, and has been leading, to the world communist revolution of the proletariat, was described in our old Marxist programme in the following terms.

(4) "The principal specific feature of this society is commodity production based on capitalist production relations, under which the most important and major part of the means of production and exchange of commodities belongs to a numerically small class of persons while the vast majority of the population is made up of proletarians and semi-proletarians, who, owing to their economic position, are compelled permanently or periodically to sell their labour-power, i.e., to hire themselves out to the capitalists and to create by their labour the incomes of the upper classes of society.

(5) "The ascendancy of capitalist production relations extends its area more and more with the steady improvement of technology, which, by enhancing the economic importance of the large enterprises, tends to eliminate the small independent producers, converting some of them into pro-

letarians and narrowing the role of others in the social and economic sphere, and in some places making them more or less completely, more or less obviously, more or less painfully dependent on capital.

(6) "Moreover, this technical progress enables the employers to make growing use of female and child labour in the process of production and exchange of commodities. And since, on the other hand, it causes a relative decrease in the employers' demand for human labour-power, the demand for labour-power necessarily lags behind its supply, as a result of which the dependence of wage-labour on capital is increased and exploitation of labour rises to a higher level.

(7) "This state of affairs in the bourgeois countries and the steadily growing competition among them in the world market make it more and more difficult for them to sell the goods which are produced in ever-increasing quantities. Over-production, manifesting itself in more or less acute industrial crises followed by more or less protracted periods of industrial stagnation, is an inevitable consequence of the development of the productive forces in bourgeois society. Crises and periods of industrial stagnation, in their turn, still further ruin the small producers, still further increase the dependence of wage-labour on capital, and lead still more rapidly to the relative and sometimes to the absolute deterioration of the condition of the working class.

(8) "Thus, improvement in technology, signifying increased labour productivity and greater social wealth, becomes in bourgeois society the cause of greater social inequality, of widening gulfs between the rich and poor, of greater insecurity, unemployment, and various hardships of the mass of the working people.

(9) "However, in proportion as all these contradictions, which are inherent in bourgeois society, grow and develop, so also does the discontent of the toiling and exploited masses with the existing order of things grow; the numerical strength and solidarity of the proletarians increase and their struggle against their exploiters is sharpened. At the same time, by concentrating the means of production and exchange and socialising the process of labour in capitalist enterprises, the improvement in technology more and more rapidly creates the material possibility of capitalist pro-

duction relations being superseded by communist relations, i.e., the possibility of bringing about the social revolution, which is the ultimate aim of all the activities of the international communist party as the conscious exponent of the class movement of the proletariat.

(10) "By introducing social in place of private ownership of the means of production and exchange, by introducing planned organisation of social production to ensure the well-being and many-sided development of all the members of society, the proletarian social revolution will do away with the division of society into classes and thereby emancipate the whole of oppressed humanity, for it will put an end to all forms of exploitation of one section of society by another.

(11) "A necessary condition for this social revolution is the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., the conquest by the proletariat of such political power as will enable it to suppress all resistance on the part of the exploiters. Aiming at making the proletariat capable of fulfilling its great historic mission, the international communist party organises the proletariat in an independent political party opposed to all the bourgeois parties, guides all the manifestations of its class struggle, reveals to it the irreconcilable antagonism between the interests of the exploiters and those of the exploited, and explains to the proletariat the historical significance of and the necessary conditions for the impending social revolution. At the same time it reveals to all the other toiling and exploited masses the hopelessness of their position in capitalist society and the need for a social revolution if they are to free themselves from the yoke of capital. The Communist Party, the party of the working class, calls upon all sections of the working and exploited population to join its ranks insofar as they adopt the standpoint of the proletariat."

* * *

(12) World capitalism has at the present time, i.e., about the beginning of the twentieth century, reached the stage of imperialism. Imperialism, or the epoch of finance capital, is a high stage of development of the capitalist economic

system, one in which monopoly associations of capitalists—syndicates, cartels, and trusts—have assumed decisive importance; in which enormously concentrated banking capital has fused with industrial capital; in which the export of capital to foreign countries has assumed vast dimensions; in which the whole world has been divided up territorially among the richer countries, and the economic carve-up of the world among international trusts has begun.

(13) Imperialist wars, i.e., wars for world domination, for markets for banking capital and for the subjugation of small and weaker nations, are inevitable under such a state of affairs. The first great imperialist war, the war of 1914-18, is precisely such a war.

(14) The extremely high level of development which world capitalism in general has attained, the replacement of free competition by monopoly capitalism, the fact that the banks and the capitalist associations have prepared the machinery for the social regulation of the process of production and distribution of products, the rise in the cost of living and increased oppression of the working class by the syndicates due to the growth of capitalist monopolies, the tremendous obstacles standing in the way of the proletariat's economic and political struggle, the horrors, misery, ruin, and brutalisation caused by the imperialist war—all these factors transform the present stage of capitalist development into an era of proletarian socialist revolution.

That era has dawned.

(15) Only a proletarian socialist revolution can lead humanity out of the impasse which imperialism and imperialist wars have created. Whatever difficulties the revolution may have to encounter, whatever possible temporary setbacks or waves of counter-revolution it may have to contend with, the final victory of the proletariat is inevitable.

* * *

(16) The victory of the proletarian revolution calls for the complete confidence, the closest fraternal alliance and the greatest possible unity of revolutionary action on the part of the working class of all the advanced countries. These conditions cannot be created without a determined,

principled rupture with, and a relentless struggle against, those bourgeois distortions of socialism that have gained the upper hand in the top echelons of the vast majority of official "Social-Democratic" and "socialist" parties.

(17) One such distortion, on the one hand, is the trend of opportunism and social-chauvinism, socialism in words but chauvinism in deeds, the concealment of the defence of the predatory interests of one's "own" national bourgeoisie behind the slogan of "defence of the fatherland", both in general and during the imperialist war of 1914-18 in particular. This trend has come into being because in nearly all the advanced countries, the bourgeoisie, by plundering the colonial and weak nations, has been able to bribe the upper stratum of the proletariat with crumbs from the superprofits, to ensure them in peace-time a tolerable, petty-bourgeois existence, and to take the leaders of that stratum into its service. The opportunists and social-chauvinists, being servants of the bourgeoisie, are real class enemies of the proletariat.

(18) Another bourgeois distortion of socialism is, on the other hand, the "Centrist" trend, which is equally broad and international, which wavers between the social-chauvinists and the Communists, advocates unity with the former and is attempting to resuscitate the bankrupt and putrid Second International. The only really proletarian and revolutionary International is the new, Third, Communist International, that has actually been founded by the formation of Communist Parties out of the former socialist parties in a number of countries, particularly in Germany, and is gaining the growing sympathy of the proletarian masses in all countries.

* * *

THE BASIC TASKS OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT IN RUSSIA

In Russia today the basic tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat are to carry through to the end, to complete, the expropriation of the landowners and bourgeoisie that has already begun, and the transfer of all factories, railways, banks, the merchant fleet and other means of production and exchange to ownership by the Soviet Republic;

to employ the alliance of urban workers and poor peasants, which has already led to the abolition of private ownership of land, and the law on the transitional form between small-peasant farming and socialism, which modern ideologists of the peasantry that has put itself on the side of the proletarians have called socialisation of the land, for a gradual but steady transition to joint tillage and large-scale socialist agriculture;

to strengthen and further develop the Federative Republic of Soviets as an immeasurably higher and more progressive form of democracy than bourgeois parliamentarism, and as the sole type of state corresponding, on the basis of the experience of the Paris Commune of 1871 and equally of the experience of the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917-18, to the transitional period between capitalism and socialism, i.e., to the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat;

by employing in every way the torch of world socialist revolution lit in Russia to paralyse the attempts of the imperialist bourgeois states to intervene in the internal affairs of Russia or to unite for direct struggle and war against the socialist Soviet Republic and to carry the revolution into the most advanced countries and in general into all coun-

tries; by a number of gradual but undeviating measures to abolish private trading completely and to organise the regular, planned exchange of products between producers' and consumers' communes to form the single economic entity the Soviet Republic must become.

The Russian Communist Party, developing the general tasks of the Soviet government in greater detail, at present formulates them as follows.

In the Political Sphere

Prior to the capture of political power by the proletariat it was (obligatory) necessary to make use of bourgeois democracy, parliamentarism in particular, for the political education and organisation of the working masses; now that the proletariat has won political power and a higher type of democracy is being put into effect in the Soviet Republic, any step backward to bourgeois parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy would undoubtedly be reactionary service to the interests of the exploiters, the landowners and capitalists. Such catchwords as supposedly popular, national, general, extra-class but actually bourgeois democracy serve the interests of the exploiters alone, and as long as the land and other means of production remain private property the most democratic republic must inevitably remain a bourgeois dictatorship, a machine for the suppression of the overwhelming majority of working people by a handful of capitalists.

The historical task that has fallen to the lot of the Soviet Republic, a new type of state that is transitional until the state disappears altogether, is the following.

(1) The creation and development of universal mass organisations of precisely those classes that are oppressed under capitalism—the proletariat and semi-proletariat. A bourgeois-democratic republic at best permits the organisation of the exploited masses, by declaring them free to organise, but actually has always placed countless obstacles in the way of their organisation, obstacles that were connected with the private ownership of the means of production in a way that made them irremovable. For the first time in history, Soviet power has not only greatly facilitated the

organisation of the masses who were oppressed under capitalism, but has made that organisation the essential permanent basis of the entire state apparatus, local and central, from top to bottom. Only in this way is it possible to ensure democracy for the great majority of the population (the working people), i.e., actual participation in state administration, in contrast to the actual administration of the state mainly by members of the bourgeois classes as is the case in the most democratic bourgeois republics.

(2) The Soviet system of state administration gives a certain actual advantage to that section of the working people that all the capitalist development that preceded socialism has made the most concentrated, united, educated and steeled in the struggle, i.e., to the urban industrial proletariat. This advantage must be used systematically and unswervingly to counteract the narrow guild and narrow trade interests that capitalism fostered among the workers and which split them into competitive groups, by uniting the most backward and disunited masses of rural proletarians and semi-proletarians more closely with the advanced workers, by snatching them away from the influence of the village kulaks and village bourgeoisie, and organising and educating them for communist development.

(3) Bourgeois democracy that solemnly announced the equality of all citizens, in actual fact hypocritically concealed the domination of the capitalist exploiters and deceived the masses with the idea that the equality of exploiters and exploited is possible. The Soviet organisation of the state destroys this deception and this hypocrisy by the implementation of real democracy, i.e., the real equality of all working people, and by excluding the exploiters from the category of members of society possessing full rights. The experience of world history, the experience of all revolts of the exploited classes against their exploiters shows the inevitability of long and desperate resistance of the exploiters in their struggle to retain their privileges. Soviet state organisation is adapted to the suppression of that resistance, for unless it is suppressed there can be no question of a victorious communist revolution.

(4) The more direct influence of the working masses on state structure and administration—i.e., a higher form of

democracy—is also effected under the Soviet type of state, first, by the electoral procedure and the possibility of holding elections more frequently, and also by conditions for re-election and for the recall of deputies which are simpler and more comprehensible to the urban and rural workers than is the case under the best forms of bourgeois democracy;

(5) secondly, by making the economic, industrial unit (factory) and not a territorial division the primary electoral unit and the nucleus of the state structure under Soviet power. This closer contact between the state apparatus and the masses of advanced proletarians that capitalism has united, in addition to effecting a higher level of democracy, also makes it possible to effect profound socialist reforms.

(6) Soviet organisation has made possible the creation of armed forces of workers and peasants which are much more closely connected with the working and exploited people than before. If this had not been done it would have been impossible to achieve one of the basic conditions for the victory of socialism—the arming of the workers and the disarming of the bourgeoisie.

(7) Soviet organisation has developed incomparably farther and deeper that feature of bourgeois democracy which marks historically its great progressive nature as compared with medieval times, i.e., the participation of the people in the election of individuals to office. In none of the most democratic bourgeois states have the working masses ever been able to enjoy the electoral rights formally granted them by the bourgeoisie (who actually hinder their enjoyment) anywhere near as extensively, frequently, universally, easily and simply as they are enjoyed under Soviet power. Soviet power has, at the same time, swept away those negative aspects of bourgeois democracy that the Paris Commune began to abolish, i.e., parliamentarism, or the separation of legislative and executive powers, the narrow, limited nature of which Marxism has long since indicated. By merging the two aspects of government the Soviets bring the state apparatus closer to the working people and remove the fence of the bourgeois parliament that fooled the masses with hypocritical signboards concealing the financial and stock-exchange deals of parliamentary businessmen and

ensured the inviolability of the bourgeois apparatus of state administration.

(8) Soviet state organisation alone has enabled the proletarian revolution to smash the old bourgeois state apparatus at one blow and destroy it to the very foundations; had this not been done no start could have been made on socialist development. Those strongholds of the bureaucracy which everywhere, both under monarchies and in the most democratic bourgeois republics, has always kept the state bound to the interests of the landowners and capitalists, have been destroyed in present-day Russia. The struggle against the bureaucracy, however, is certainly not over in our country. The bureaucracy is trying to regain some of its positions and is taking advantage, on the one hand, of the unsatisfactory cultural level of the masses of the people and, on the other, of the tremendous, almost superhuman war efforts of the most developed section of the urban workers. The continuation of the struggle against the bureaucracy, therefore, is absolutely necessary, is imperative, to ensure the success of future socialist development.

(9) Work in this field is closely connected with the implementation of the chief historical purpose of Soviet power, i.e., to advance towards the final abolition of the state, and should consist of the following. First, every member of a Soviet must, without fail, do a certain job of state administration; secondly, these jobs must be consistently changed so that they embrace all aspects of government, all its branches; and, thirdly, literally all the working population must be drawn into independent participation in state administration by means of a series of gradual measures that are carefully selected and unfailingly implemented.

(10) By and large, the difference between bourgeois democracy and parliamentarism on the one hand, and Soviet or proletarian democracy on the other, boils down to this: the centre of gravity of the former is in its solemn and pompous declarations of numerous liberties and rights which the majority of the population, the workers and peasants, cannot enjoy to the full. Proletarian, or Soviet, democracy, on the contrary, has transferred the centre of gravity away from the declaration of rights and liberties for the entire people to the actual participation of none but the working

people, who were oppressed and exploited by capital, in the administration of the state, the actual use of the best buildings and other premises for meetings and congresses, the best printing-works and the biggest warehouses (stocks) of paper for the education of those who were stultified and downtrodden under capitalism, and to providing a real (actual) opportunity for those masses gradually to free themselves from the burden of religious prejudices, etc., etc. It is precisely in making the benefits of culture, civilisation and democracy really available to the working and exploited people that Soviet power sees its most important work, work which it must continue unswervingly in the future.

The policy of the R.C.P. on the national question, unlike the bourgeois-democratic declaration of the equality of nations, which cannot be implemented under imperialism, is that of steadily drawing together and merging the proletarians and the working masses of all nations in their revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Among the working people of the nations that entered into the Russian Empire the mistrust of the Great Russians that has been inherited from the epoch of tsarist and bourgeois Great-Russian imperialism is rapidly vanishing, under the influence of their acquaintance with Soviet Russia, but that mistrust has not yet completely disappeared among all nations and among all sections of the working people. It is, therefore, necessary to exercise special caution in respect of national feelings and to ensure the pursuance of a policy of actual equality and freedom to secede so as to remove the grounds for this mistrust and achieve the close voluntary union of the Soviet republics of all nations. Aid to backward and weak nations must be increased by assisting the independent organisation and education of the workers and peasants of all nations in the struggle against medieval and bourgeois oppression and also by assisting in the development of the language and literature of nations that have been oppressed or have been underprivileged.

In respect of the policy on religion the task of the (R.C.P.) dictatorship of the proletariat must not be confined to decreeing the separation of the church from the state and the school from the church, that is, to measures promised by bourgeois democrats but never fully carried out anywhere in

the world because of the many and varied connections actually existing between capital and religious propaganda. The proletarian dictatorship must completely destroy the connection between the exploiting classes—the landowners and capitalists—and the organisation of religious propaganda as something which keeps the masses in ignorance. The proletarian dictatorship must consistently effect the real emancipation of the working people from religious prejudices, doing so by means of propaganda and by raising the political consciousness of the masses but carefully avoiding anything that may hurt the feelings of the religious section of the population and serve to increase religious fanaticism.

In the sphere of public education, the object of the R.C.P. is to complete the work that began with the October Revolution in 1917 to convert the school from an instrument of the class rule of the bourgeoisie into an instrument for the overthrow of that rule and for the complete abolition of the division of society into classes.

In the period of the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., in the period in which conditions are being prepared for the full realisation of communism, the school must be the vehicle, not merely of the general principles of communism but also of the ideological, organisational and educational influence of the proletariat on the semi-proletarian and non-proletarian sections of the working people, in order to train a generation that is fully capable of building communism.

The immediate tasks in this field are, for the present, the following.

(1) The implementation of free, obligatory general and polytechnical education (acquaintance with all the main branches of production theoretically and in practice) for all children of both sexes up to the age of 16.

(2) The closest connection between schooling and productive social labour.

(3) The provision of food, clothing, books and other teaching aids for all school children at the expense of the state.

(4) Greater agitation and propaganda among school-teachers.

(5) The training of new teaching staffs imbued with communist ideas.

(6) The working people must be drawn into active participation in the work of education (the development of the public education councils, mobilisation of the educated, etc.).

(7) All-round help on the part of Soviet power in the matter of the self-education and self-development of workers and working peasants (organisation of libraries, schools for adults, people's universities, courses of lectures, cinemas, studios, etc.).

(8) Development of the most extensive propaganda of communist ideas.

The Russian Communist Party, developing the general tasks of the Soviet government in greater detail, at present formulates them as follows.

In the Economic Sphere

The present tasks of Soviet power are:

(1) To continue steadily and finish the expropriation of the bourgeoisie and the conversion of the means of production and distribution into the property of the Soviet Republic, i.e., into the common property of all working people, which has in the main been completed.

(2) To pay particularly great attention to the development and strengthening of comradely discipline among the working people and to stimulate their initiative and sense of responsibility in every field. This is the most important if not the sole means of completely overcoming capitalism and the habits formed by the rule of the private ownership of the means of production. This aim can be achieved only by slow, persistent work to re-educate the masses; this re-education has not only become possible now that the masses have seen that the landowner, capitalist and merchant have really been eliminated, but is actually taking place in thousands of ways through the practical experience of the workers and peasants themselves. It is extremely important in this respect to work for the further organisation of the working people in trade unions; never before has this organisation developed as rapidly anywhere in the world as under Soviet power, and it must be developed until literally all working people are organised

in properly constituted, centralised and disciplined trade unions. We must not confine ourselves to the old, stereotyped forms of the trade union movement, but must, on the one hand, systematically convert the trade unions into organs administering the economy, carefully checking every step we take against the results of practical work; there must be greater and stronger bonds between the trade unions and the Supreme Economic Council, the Commissariat of Labour and, later, with all other branches of the state administration; on the other hand, the trade unions must to a greater degree become organs for the labour and socialist education of the working masses as a whole so that the practical experience of participation in the administration spreads to the more backward sections of the workers, under the control of the vanguard of the workers.

(3) One of the basic tasks is to raise the level of labour productivity, for without this the full transition to communism is impossible. In addition to lengthy work to educate the masses and raise their cultural level, the achievement of this goal requires the immediate, extensive and comprehensive employment in science and technology of those specialists who have been left us as our heritage from capitalism and, as a rule, are imbued with the bourgeois world outlook and habits. The Party, in close alliance with the trade union organisations, must continue its former line—on the one hand, there must not be the slightest political concession to this bourgeois section of the population, and any counter-revolutionary attempts on its part must be ruthlessly suppressed, and, on the other hand, there must be a relentless struggle against the pseudo-radical but actually ignorant and conceited opinion that the working people are capable of overcoming capitalism and the bourgeois social system without learning from bourgeois specialists, without making use of their services and without undergoing the training of a lengthy period of work side by side with them.

Although our ultimate aim is to achieve full communism and equal remuneration for all kinds of work, we cannot introduce this equality straightaway, at the present time, when only the first steps of the transition from capitalism to communism are being taken. For a certain period of time,

therefore, we must retain the present higher remuneration for specialists in order to give them an incentive to work no worse, and even better, than they have worked before; and with the same object in view we must not reject the system of paying bonuses for the most successful work, particularly organisational work; bonuses would be impermissible under a full communist system but in the period of transition from capitalism to communism bonuses are indispensable, as is borne out by theory and by a year's experience of Soviet power.

We must, furthermore, work consistently to surround the bourgeois specialists with a comradely atmosphere created by working hand in hand with the masses of rank-and-file workers led by politically-conscious Communists; we must not be dismayed by the inevitable individual failures but must strive patiently to arouse in people possessing scientific knowledge a consciousness of how loathsome it is to use science for personal enrichment and for the exploitation of man by man, a consciousness of the more lofty aim of using science for the purpose of making it known to the working people.

(4) The building of communism undoubtedly requires the greatest possible and most strict centralisation of labour on a nation-wide scale, and this presumes overcoming the scattering and disunity of workers, by trades and locally, which was one of the sources of capital's strength and labour's weakness. The struggle against the narrowness and limitations of the guild and against its egoism is closely connected with the struggle to remove the antithesis between town and country; it presents great difficulties and cannot be begun on a broad scale without first achieving a considerable increase in the productivity of the people's labour. A start on this work must, however, be made immediately, if at first only on a small, local scale and by way of experiment for the purpose of comparing the results of various measures undertaken in different trades and in different places. The mobilisation of the entire able-bodied population by the Soviet government, with the trade unions participating, for certain public works must be much more widely and systematically practised than has hitherto been the case.

(5) In the sphere of distribution, the present task of Soviet power is to continue steadily replacing trade by the planned, organised and nation-wide distribution of goods. The goal is the organisation of the entire population in producers' and consumers' communes that can distribute all essential products most rapidly, systematically, economically and with the least expenditure of labour by strictly centralising the entire distribution machinery. The co-operatives are a transitional means of achieving this aim. The use of them is similar to the use of bourgeois specialists insofar as the co-operative machinery we have inherited from capitalism is in the hands of people whose thinking and business habits are bourgeois. The R.C.P. must systematically pursue the policy of making it obligatory for all members of the Party to work in the co-operatives and, with the aid of the trade unions, direct them in a communist spirit, develop the initiative and discipline of the working people who belong to them, endeavour to get the entire population to join them, and the co-operatives themselves to merge into one single co-operative that embraces the whole of the Soviet Republic. Lastly, and most important, the dominating influence of the proletariat over the rest of the working people must be constantly maintained, and everywhere the most varied measures must be tried with a view to facilitating and bringing about the transition from petty-bourgeois co-operatives of the old capitalist type to producers' and consumers' communes led by proletarians and semi-proletarians.

(6) It is impossible to abolish money at one stroke in the first period of transition from capitalism to communism. As a consequence the bourgeois elements of the population continue to use privately-owned currency notes—these tokens by which the exploiters obtain the right to receive public wealth—for the purpose of speculation, profit-making and robbing the working population. The nationalisation of the banks is insufficient in itself to combat this survival of bourgeois robbery. The R.C.P. will strive as speedily as possible to introduce the most radical measures to pave the way for the abolition of money, first and foremost to replace it by savings-bank books, cheques, short-term notes entitling the holders to receive goods from the public

stores, and so forth, to make it compulsory for money to be deposited in the banks, etc. Practical experience in paving the way for, and carrying out, these and similar measures will show which of them are the most expedient.

(7) In the sphere of finance, the R.C.P. will introduce a graduated income-and-property tax in all cases where it is feasible. But these cases cannot be numerous since private property in land, the majority of factories and other enterprises has been abolished. In the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the state ownership of the principal means of production, the state finances must be based on the direct appropriation of a certain part of the revenue from the different state monopolies to meet the needs of the state. Revenue and expenditure can be balanced only if the exchange of commodities is properly organised, and this will be achieved by the organisation of producers' and consumers' communes and the restoration of the transport system, which is one of the major immediate objects of the Soviet government.

In the Sphere of Agriculture

After the abolition of private property in land and the [almost] complete expropriation of the landowners and the promulgation of a law on the socialisation of the land which regards as preferable the large-scale farming of commonly-owned estates, the chief task of Soviet power is to discover and test in practice the most expedient and practical transitional measures to effect this.

The main line and the guiding principle of the R.C.P. agrarian policy under these circumstances still remains the effort to rely on the proletarian and semi-proletarian elements of the countryside. They must first and foremost be organised into an independent force, they must be brought closer to the urban proletariat and wrested from the influence of the rural bourgeoisie and petty-property interests. The organisation of Poor Peasants' Committees was one step in this direction; the organisation of Party cells in the villages, the re-election of Soviet deputies to exclude the kulaks, the establishment of special types of trade unions for the proletarians and semi-proletarians of the country-

side—all these and similar measures must be effected without fail.

As far as the kulaks, the rural bourgeoisie, are concerned, the policy of the R.C.P. is one of decisive struggle against their attempts at exploitation and the suppression of their resistance to Soviet socialist policy.

As far as the middle peasant is concerned, the policy of the R.C.P. is one of a cautious attitude towards him; he must not be confused with the kulak and coercive measures must not be used against him; by his class position the middle peasant can be the ally of the proletarian government during the transition to socialism, or, at least, he can remain a neutral element. Despite the unavoidable partial failures and waverings of the middle peasant, therefore, we must strive persistently to reach agreement with him, showing a solicitous attitude to all his desires and making concessions in selecting ways of carrying out socialist reforms. In this respect a prominent place must be given to the struggle against the abuses of those representatives of Soviet power who, hypocritically taking advantage of the title of Communist, are carrying out a policy that is not communist but is a policy of the bureaucracy, of officialdom; such people must be ruthlessly banished and a stricter control established with the aid of the trade unions and by other means.

Insofar as concerns measures for the transition to communist farming, the R.C.P. will test in practice three principal measures that have already taken shape—state farms, agricultural communes and societies (and co-operatives) for the collective tilling of the soil, care being taken to ensure their more extensive and more correct application, especially in respect of ways of developing the voluntary participation of the peasants in these new forms of co-operative farming and of the organisation of the working peasantry to carry out control from below and ensure comradesly discipline.

The R.C.P. food policy upholds the consolidation and development of the state monopoly, and does not reject the use of co-operatives and private traders or the employees of trading firms, or the application of a system of bonuses, on the condition that it is controlled by Soviet power and serves the purpose of the better organisation of the business.

The partial concessions that have to be made from time to time are only due to the extreme acuteness of need and never imply a refusal to strive persistently to implement the state monopoly. It is very difficult to implement it in a country of small peasant farms, it requires lengthy work and the practical testing of a number of transitional measures that lead to the goal by various ways, i.e., that lead to the universal organisation and correct functioning of producers' and consumers' communes that hand over all food surpluses to the state.

2

DRAFT PROGRAMME OF THE R.C.P. (BOLSHEVIKS)

(1) The Revolution of October 25 (November 7), 1917 established the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia which began, with the support of the poor peasantry or semi-proletariat, to lay the foundations of a communist society. The growth of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat in all advanced countries, the universal emergence and development of the Soviet form of that movement, i.e., a form which aims directly at the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and, lastly, the beginning and progress of the revolution in Austria-Hungary and, particularly, in Germany, all goes to show vividly that the era of the world proletarian, communist revolution has begun.

(2) The causes, significance and aims of this revolution can be correctly understood only by making clear the real nature of capitalism and the inevitability of its development towards communism through imperialism and the imperialist wars that are accelerating the collapse of capitalism.

* * *

(3) The nature of capitalism and of the bourgeois society which still dominates in most civilised countries and the development of which inevitably leads to the world communist revolution of the proletariat was correctly described in our old Programme (if we disregard the inaccurate name of Social-Democratic Party) in the following terms.

(4) "The principal specific feature of this society is commodity production based on capitalist production relations, under which the most important and major part of the

means of production and exchange of commodities belongs to a numerically small class of persons while the vast majority of the population is made up of proletarians and semi-proletarians, who, owing to their economic position, are compelled permanently or periodically to sell their labour-power, i.e., to hire themselves out to the capitalists and to create by their labour the incomes of the upper classes of society.

(5) "The ascendancy of capitalist production relations extends its area more and more with the steady improvement of technology, which, by enhancing the economic importance of the large enterprises, tends to eliminate the small independent producers, converting some of them into proletarians and narrowing the role of others in the social and economic sphere, and in some places making them more or less completely, more or less obviously, more or less painfully dependent on capital.

(6) "Moreover, this technical progress enables the employers to make growing use of female and child labour in the process of production and exchange of commodities. And since, on the other hand, it causes a relative decrease in the employers' demand for human labour-power, the demand for labour-power necessarily lags behind its supply, as a result of which the dependence of wage-labour on capital is increased and exploitation of labour rises to a higher level.

(7) "This state of affairs in the bourgeois countries and the steadily growing competition among them in the world market make it more and more difficult for them to sell the goods which are produced in ever-increasing quantities. Over-production, manifesting itself in more or less acute industrial crises followed by more or less protracted periods of industrial stagnation, is an inevitable consequence of the development of the productive forces in bourgeois society. Crises and periods of industrial stagnation, in their turn, still further ruin the small producers, still further increase the dependence of wage-labour on capital, and lead still more rapidly to the relative and sometimes to the absolute deterioration of the condition of the working class.

(8) "Thus, improvement in technology, signifying increased labour productivity and greater social wealth, becomes in

bourgeois society the cause of greater social inequality, of widening gulfs between the rich and poor, of greater insecurity, unemployment, and various hardships of the mass of the working people.

(9) "However, in proportion as all these contradictions, which are inherent in bourgeois society, grow and develop, so also does the discontent of the toiling and exploited masses with the existing order of things grow; the numerical strength and solidarity of the proletarians increase and their struggle against their exploiters is sharpened. At the same time, by concentrating the means of production and exchange and socialising the process of labour in capitalist enterprises, the improvement in technology more and more rapidly creates the material possibility of capitalist production relations being superseded by communist relations, i.e., the possibility of bringing about the social revolution, which is the ultimate aim of all the activities of the international communist party as the conscious exponent of the class movement of the proletariat.

(10) "By introducing social in place of private ownership of the means of production and exchange, by introducing planned organisation of social production to ensure the well-being and many-sided development of all the members of society, the proletarian social revolution will do away with the division of society into classes and thereby emancipate the whole of oppressed humanity, for it will put an end to all forms of exploitation of one section of society by another.

(11) "A necessary condition for this social revolution is the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., the conquest by the proletariat of such political power as will enable it to suppress all resistance on the part of the exploiters. Aiming at making the proletariat capable of fulfilling its great historic mission, the international communist party organises the proletariat in an independent political party opposed to all the bourgeois parties, guides all the manifestations of its class struggle, reveals to it the irreconcilable antagonism between the interests of the exploiters and those of the exploited, and explains to the proletariat the historical significance of and the necessary conditions for the impending social revolution. At the same time it reveals

to all the other toiling and exploited masses the hopelessness of their position in capitalist society and the need for a social revolution if they are to free themselves from the yoke of capital. The Communist Party, the party of the working class, calls upon all sections of the working and exploited population to join its ranks insofar as they adopt the standpoint of the proletariat."

* * *

(12) The concentration and centralisation of capital which destroys free competition, had, by the turn of the twentieth century, created powerful monopoly associations of capitalists—syndicates, cartels and trusts—that became of decisive importance in all economic life, had led to the merging of bank capital and highly concentrated industrial capital, to the increased export of capital to other countries and to the stage which marked the beginning of the economic division of the world among the trusts that embrace ever-growing groups of capitalist powers when it had already been divided territorially between the richest countries. This epoch of finance capital, the epoch of a struggle between capitalist states unparalleled in its ferocity, is the epoch of imperialism.

(13) The inevitable outcome of this is imperialist wars, wars for markets, spheres of investment, raw materials and cheap labour-power, i.e., for world domination and the crushing of small and weak peoples. The first great imperialist war of 1914-18 was a war of this type.

(14) The extremely high level of development which world capitalism in general has attained, the replacement of free competition by state monopoly capitalism, the fact that the banks and the capitalist associations have prepared the machinery for the social regulation of the process of production and distribution of products, the rise in the cost of living and increased oppression of the working class by the syndicates and its enslavement by the imperialist state due to the growth of capitalist monopolies, the tremendous obstacles standing in the way of the proletariat's economic and political struggle, the horrors, misery, ruin, and brutalisation caused by the imperialist war—all

these factors transform the present stage of capitalist development into an era of proletarian communist revolution.

That era has dawned.

(15) Only a proletarian communist revolution can lead humanity out of the impasse which imperialism and imperialist wars have created. Whatever difficulties the revolution may have to encounter, whatever possible temporary setbacks or waves of counter-revolution it may have to contend with, the final victory of the proletariat is inevitable.

* * *

(16) The victory of the world proletarian revolution calls for the complete confidence, the closest fraternal alliance and the greatest possible unity of revolutionary action on the part of the working class of the advanced countries. These conditions cannot be created without a determined, principled rupture with, and a relentless struggle against, those bourgeois distortions of socialism that have gained the upper hand in the top echelons of the official "Social-Democratic" and "socialist" parties.

(17) One such distortion, on the one hand, is the trend of opportunism and social-chauvinism, socialism in words but chauvinism in deeds, the concealment of the defence of the predatory interests of one's "own" national bourgeoisie behind the false slogan of "defence of the fatherland", both in general and during the imperialist war of 1914-18 in particular. This trend has come into being because in the advanced capitalist states, the bourgeoisie, by plundering the colonial and weak nations, has been able to bribe the upper stratum of the proletariat with crumbs from the superprofits obtained from this plunder and ensure them in peace-time a tolerable, petty-bourgeois existence, and to take the leaders of that stratum into its service. The opportunists and social-chauvinists, being servants of the bourgeoisie, are real class enemies of the proletariat, especially today, when, in alliance with the capitalists, they are crushing the proletarian revolutionary movement with a mailed fist, both in their own and in other countries.

(18) Another bourgeois distortion of socialism is, on the other hand, the "Centrist" trend, also to be found in all

capitalist countries, which wavers between the social-chauvinists and the Communists, advocates unity with the former and is attempting to resuscitate the bankrupt Second International. The only leader of the proletariat in its struggle for emancipation is the new, Third, Communist International that has actually been founded by the formation of Communist Parties from the truly proletarian elements of the former socialist parties in a number of countries, particularly in Germany, and is gaining the growing sympathy of the proletarian masses in all countries. This International is returning to Marxism, not only in its name, but in all its political and ideological content, and in all its activities is implementing the revolutionary doctrine of Marx, cleansed of bourgeois opportunist distortions.

Pravda No. 43,
February 25, 1919

Published according to
a typewritten copy
corrected by Lenin

3

INSERTION FOR POLITICAL SECTION
OF THE PROGRAMME

To avoid making an incorrect generalisation of transient historical needs the R.C.P. must also explain to the working people that in the Soviet Republic the disfranchisement of a section of the citizens does not mean, as was the case in the majority of bourgeois-democratic republics, that a definite category of citizens are disfranchised for life. It applies only to the exploiters, to those who, in violation of the fundamental laws of the socialist Soviet Republic, persist in their efforts to cling to their exploiters' status and to preserve capitalist relations. Consequently, in the Soviet Republic, on the one hand, as socialism grows daily stronger and the number of those who are objectively able to remain exploiters or preserve capitalist relations is reduced, the number of disfranchised persons will automatically diminish. Even now the disfranchised persons in Russia constitute barely two or three per cent of the population. On the other hand, in the very near future, the cessation of foreign invasion and the completion of the expropriation of the expropriators may, under certain circumstances, create a situation where the proletarian state will choose other methods of suppressing the resistance of the exploiters and will introduce unrestricted universal suffrage.

4

FRAGMENT OF THE POLITICAL SECTION
OF THE PROGRAMME

The Soviet Constitution ensures the working people immeasurably larger opportunities than are provided by bourgeois democracy and parliamentarism to *elect and recall* deputies in a way that is most easy and accessible for workers and peasants; it also eliminates the negative aspects of parliamentarism which have been evident since the Paris Commune, particularly the division of *legislative and executive* power, the alienation of parliament from the masses, and so forth.

The Soviet Constitution also brings the machinery of state closer to the masses by making the electoral constituency and the basic unit of the state not territorial but industrial units (the factory, etc.).

The closer contact between the machinery of state and the masses under the Soviet system makes it possible to create...²⁰

5

SECTION OF THE PROGRAMME
ON NATIONAL RELATIONS

On the national question, the policy of the proletariat which has captured political power—unlike that of the bourgeois-democratic formal proclamation of equality of nations, which is impossible under imperialism—is persistently to bring about the real rapprochement and amalgamation of the workers and peasants of all nations in their revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. To achieve this object, the colonial and other nations which are oppressed, or whose rights are restricted, must be completely liberated and granted the right to secede as a guarantee that the sentiment inherited from capitalism, the distrust of the working people of the various nations and the wrath which the workers of the oppressed nations feel towards the workers of the oppressor nations, will be fully dispelled and replaced by a conscious and voluntary alliance. The workers of those nations which under capitalism were oppressor nations must take exceptional care not to hurt the national sentiments of the oppressed nations (for example, the attitude of the Great Russians, Ukrainians and Poles towards the Jews, the attitude of the Tatars towards the Bashkirs, and so forth) and must not only promote the actual equality, but also the development of the language and literature of the working people of the formerly oppressed nations so as to remove all traces of distrust and alienation inherited from the epoch of capitalism.

6

INSERTION FOR THE FINAL DRAFT
OF THE PROGRAMME SECTION
ON THE NATIONAL QUESTION

On the question of who expresses the will of the nation on the matter of secession, the R.C.P. upholds the historical class view and takes into consideration the level of historical development of the nation concerned—on the way from the Middle Ages to bourgeois democracy, or from bourgeois to Soviet or proletarian democracy, etc. In any case, on the part of...²¹

7

PREAMBLE TO THE MILITARY SECTION
OF THE PROGRAMME

The state of affairs in the sphere of the military tasks and military activities of the Soviet Republic under the dictatorship of the proletariat is as follows.

As our Party long ago foresaw, the imperialist war could not end even with the simple conclusion of a durable peace between the bourgeois governments, let alone with a just peace. This petty-bourgeois illusion entertained by democrats, socialists and Social-Democrats has been fully dispelled by the course of events. The imperialist war inevitably had to be transformed, and is being transformed before our very eyes, into the civil war of the exploited working people, headed by the proletariat, against the exploiters, against the bourgeoisie.

The resistance of the exploiters, which grows simultaneously with the intensification of the onslaught of the proletariat, and is particularly intensified by the victory of the proletariat in individual countries, and the international solidarity and organisation of the bourgeoisie inevitably cause the combination of civil war in individual countries and revolutionary wars between the proletarian countries and bourgeois countries fighting to retain the rule of capital. In view of the class character of such wars, the distinction drawn between defensive and offensive wars becomes utterly meaningless.

By and large, this development of international civil war, a process which has been taking place with exceptional rapidity before our very eyes since the end of 1918 is the legitimate product of the class struggle under capitalism

and a legitimate step towards the victory of the international proletarian revolution.

For this reason, the R.C.P. emphatically rejects the hope of disarmament under capitalism as the reactionary philistine illusion of petty-bourgeois democrats, even though they call themselves socialists and Social-Democrats, and in opposition to this and all similar slogans which actually play into the hands of the bourgeoisie, it advances the slogan of arming the proletariat and disarming the bourgeoisie, the slogan of completely and ruthlessly suppressing the resistance of the exploiters, the slogan of fighting until victory over the bourgeoisie of the whole world is achieved both in civil wars at home and in international revolutionary wars.

The practical experience of more than a year's military activity and of the formation of a proletarian revolutionary army after the incredible weariness and exhaustion of the entire mass of working people as a result of the war, has led the R.C.P. to the following main conclusions:

8

FIRST PARAGRAPH OF SECTION
OF THE PROGRAMME ON THE COURTS

On the road to communism through the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Communist Party, rejecting democratic slogans, completely abolishes also such organs of bourgeois rule as the old courts, and replaces them by the class courts of the workers and peasants. After taking all power into its hands, the proletariat puts forward, instead of the old vague formula, "Election of judges by the people", the class slogan, "Election of judges from the working people by none but the working people", and carries it into practice throughout the judicial system. In the election of judges from none but workers and peasants who do not employ wage-labour for profit, the Communist Party makes no distinction with regard to women but allows the two sexes completely equal rights both in electing judges and in exercising judicial functions. Having repealed the laws of the deposed governments, the Party gives the judges elected by Soviet electors the slogan: enforce the will of the proletariat, apply its decrees, and in the absence of a suitable decree, or if the relevant decree is inadequate, take guidance from your socialist sense of justice, ignoring the laws of the deposed governments.

9

SECTION OF THE PROGRAMME
DEALING WITH PUBLIC EDUCATION

In the sphere of public education, the object of the R.C.P. is to complete the work that began with the October Revolution in 1917 to convert the school from an instrument of the class rule of the bourgeoisie into an instrument for the overthrow of that rule and for the complete abolition of the division of society into classes. The schools must become an instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat, i.e., a vehicle not merely of the general principles of communism but also of the ideological, organisational and educational influence of the proletariat on the semi-proletarian and non-proletarian sections of the working people with the object of completely suppressing the resistance of the exploiters and of building the communist system. The immediate tasks in this field are, for the present, the following:

(1) the further development of the initiative of the workers and working peasants in the sphere of education with the all-round assistance of the Soviet government;

(2) securing complete command not only over a section, or the majority, of the school-teachers, as is the case at present, but over all school-teachers by weeding out the incorrigible bourgeois counter-revolutionary elements and securing the conscientious application of communist principles; (policy)

(3) the implementation of free, obligatory general and polytechnical education (acquaintance with all the main branches of production theoretically and in practice) for all children of both sexes up to the age of 16;

(4) the closest connection between schooling and productive social labour of the child;

(5) the provision of food, clothing, books and other teaching aids for all school children at the expense of the state;

(6) the working people must be drawn into active participation in the work of public education (the development of the public education councils, mobilisation of the educated, etc.);

or *ad* 2) (7) to secure the closest contact between school-teachers and the agitation and propaganda machinery of the R.C.P.

10

SECTION OF THE PROGRAMME
DEALING WITH RELIGION

As regards religion, the policy of the R.C.P. is not to be confined to decreeing the separation of the church from the state and the school from the church, that is, to measures promised by bourgeois democrats but never fully carried out anywhere in the world because of the many and varied connections actually existing between capital and religious propaganda.

The Party's object is to completely destroy the connection between the exploiting classes and organised religious propaganda and really liberate the working people from religious prejudices. For this purpose it must organise the most widespread scientific education and anti-religious propaganda. It is necessary, however, to take care to avoid hurting the religious sentiments of believers, for this only serves to increase religious fanaticism.

11

POINTS FROM THE ECONOMIC SECTION
OF THE PROGRAMME

The Russian Communist Party, developing the general tasks of the Soviet government in greater detail, at present formulates them as follows.

In the Economic Sphere

The present tasks of Soviet power are:

(1) to continue steadily and finish the expropriation of the bourgeoisie and the conversion of the means of production and distribution into the property of the Soviet Republic, i.e., the common property of all working people, which has in the main been completed.

(2) To pay particularly great attention to the development and strengthening of comradely discipline among the working people and to stimulate their initiative and sense of responsibility in every field. This is the most important if not the sole means of completely overcoming capitalism and the habits formed by the rule of the private ownership of the means of production. This aim can be achieved only by slow, persistent work to re-educate the masses; this re-education has not only become possible now that the masses have seen that the landowner, capitalist and merchant have really been eliminated, but is actually taking place in thousands of ways through the practical experience of the workers and peasants themselves. It is extremely important in this respect to work for the further organisation of the working people in trade unions; never before has this organisation developed as rapidly anywhere in the

world as under Soviet power, and it must be developed until literally all working people are organised in properly constituted, centralised and disciplined trade unions.

8.²² This same task of developing the productive forces calls for the immediate, extensive and comprehensive employment in science and technology of the specialists who have been left us as our heritage by capitalism, although, as a rule, they are imbued with a bourgeois world outlook and habits. The Party, in close alliance with the trade union organisations, must continue its former line—on the one hand, there must not be the slightest political concession to this bourgeois section of the population, and any counter-revolutionary attempts on its part must be ruthlessly suppressed, and, on the other hand, there must be a relentless struggle against the pseudo-radical but actually ignorant and conceited opinion that the working people are capable of overcoming capitalism and the bourgeois social system without learning from bourgeois specialists, without making use of their services and without undergoing the training of a lengthy period of work side by side with them.

Although the ultimate aim of the Soviet government is to achieve full communism and equal remuneration for all kinds of work, it cannot, however, introduce this equality straightaway, at the present time, when only the first steps of the transition from capitalism to communism are being taken. For a certain period of time, therefore, we must retain the present higher remuneration for specialists in order to give them an incentive to work no worse, and even better, than they have worked before; and with the same object in view, we must not reject the system of paying bonuses for the most successful work, particularly organisational work.

It is equally necessary to surround the bourgeois specialist with a comradely atmosphere created by working hand in hand with the masses of rank-and-file workers led by politically-conscious Communists in order to promote mutual understanding and friendship between workers by hand and brain whom capitalism kept apart.

The mobilisation of the entire able-bodied population by the Soviet government, with the trade unions participating,

for certain public works must be much more widely and systematically practised than has hitherto been the case.

In the sphere of distribution, the present task of Soviet power is to continue steadily replacing trade by the planned, organised and nation-wide distribution of goods. The goal is the organisation of the entire population in a single system of consumers' communes that can distribute all essential products most rapidly, systematically, economically and with the least expenditure of labour by strictly centralising the entire distribution machinery.

To achieve this object it is particularly important in the present period, when there are transitional forms based on different principles, for the Soviet food supply organisation to make use of the co-operative societies, the only mass apparatus for systematic distribution inherited from capitalism.

Being of the opinion that in principle the only correct policy is the further communist development of this apparatus and not its rejection, the R.C.P. must systematically pursue the policy of making it obligatory for all members of the Party to work in the co-operatives and, with the aid of the trade unions, direct them in a communist spirit, develop the initiative and discipline of the working people who belong to them, endeavour to get the entire population to join them, and the co-operatives themselves to merge into one single co-operative that embraces the whole of the Soviet Republic. Lastly, and most important, the dominating influence of the proletariat over the rest of the working people must be constantly maintained, and everywhere the most varied measures must be tried with a view to facilitating and bringing about the transition from petty-bourgeois co-operatives of the old capitalist type to consumers' communes led by proletarians and semi-proletarians.

(6) It is impossible to abolish money at one stroke in the first period of transition from capitalism to communism. As a consequence, the bourgeois elements of the population continue to use privately-owned currency notes—these tokens by which the exploiters obtain the right to receive public wealth—for the purpose of speculation, profit-making and robbing the working population. The nationalisation

of the banks is insufficient in itself to combat this survival of bourgeois robbery. The R.C.P. will strive as speedily as possible to introduce the most radical measures to pave the way for the abolition of money, first and foremost to replace it by savings-bank books, cheques, short-term notes entitling the holders to receive goods from the public stores, and so forth, to make it compulsory for money to be deposited in the banks, etc. Practical experience in paving the way for, and carrying out, these and similar measures will show which of them are the most expedient.

(7) In the sphere of finance, the R.C.P. will introduce a graduated income-and-property tax in all cases where it is feasible. But these cases cannot be numerous since private property in land, the majority of factories and other enterprises has been abolished. In the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the state ownership of the principal means of production, the state finances must be based on the direct appropriation of a certain part of the revenue from the different state monopolies to meet the needs of the state. Revenue and expenditure can be balanced only if the exchange of commodities is properly organised, and this will be achieved by the organisation of consumers' communes and the restoration of the transport system, which is one of the major immediate objects of the Soviet government.

12

AGRARIAN SECTION OF THE PROGRAMME

Soviet power, having completely abolished private property in land, has already started on the implementation of a whole series of measures aimed at the organisation of large-scale socialist agriculture. The most important of these measures are the organisation of state farms (i.e., large socialist farms), the encouragement of agricultural communes (i.e., voluntary associations of tillers of the land for large-scale farming in common), and societies and co-operatives for the collective cultivation of the land; cultivation by the state of all uncultivated lands, no matter whom they belong to; mobilisation by the state of all agricultural specialists for vigorous measures to raise farming efficiency, etc.

Regarding all these measures as the only way to raise the productivity of agricultural labour, which is absolutely imperative, the R.C.P. seeks to carry them out as fully as possible, to extend them to the more backward regions of the country, and to take further steps in this direction.

Inasmuch as the antithesis between town and country is one of the root causes of the economic and cultural backwardness of the countryside, one which in a period of so deep a crisis as the present confronts both town and country with the direct threat of ruin and collapse, the R.C.P. regards the eradication of this antithesis as one of the basic tasks of building communism and, alongside the above measures, considers it necessary extensively and systematically to enlist industrial workers for the communist development of agriculture, to promote the activities of the nation-wide Working Committee of Assistance set up by the Soviet government with this aim in view, and so on.

In all its work in the countryside the R.C.P. will continue to rely on the proletarian and semi-proletarian sections of the rural population, first organising them into an independent force, setting up Poor Peasants' Committees, Party cells in the villages, a specific type of trade union for rural proletarians and semi-proletarians, etc., exerting every effort to bring them closer to the urban proletariat and wresting them from the influence of the rural bourgeoisie and petty-property interests.

As far as the kuláks, the rural bourgeoisie, are concerned, the policy of the R.C.P. is one of decisive struggle against their attempts at exploitation and the suppression of their resistance to Soviet, communist, policy.

With regard to the middle peasants, the policy of the R.C.P. is to draw them into the work of socialist construction gradually and systematically. The Party sets itself the task of separating them from the kulaks, of winning them to the side of the working class by carefully attending to their needs, by combating their backwardness with ideological weapons and not with measures of suppression, and by striving in all cases where their vital interests are concerned to come to practical agreements with them, making concessions to them in determining the methods of carrying out socialist reforms.

***EIGHTH CONGRESS OF THE R.C.P.(B.)*²³**

MARCH 18-23, 1919

Published in *Pravda*,
March-April 1919

Published according to the
book *Eighth Congress of the
Russian Communist Party
(Bolsheviks), Verbatim Report*,
Kommunist Publishers, Moscow, 1919
Verified with the shorthand
notes and the *Pravda* text

1

SPEECH OPENING THE CONGRESS
MARCH 18

Comrades, our first words at this Congress must be dedicated to Comrade Yakov Mikhailovich Sverdlov. Comrades, as many people said at his funeral today, Yakov Mikhailovich Sverdlov was, for the Party as a whole and for the entire Soviet Republic, the principal organiser, but he was much more valuable for our Party Congress and much closer to it. We have lost a comrade who devoted his last days entirely to this Congress. His absence will affect the whole course of our proceedings, and this Congress will feel it with exceptional acuteness. Comrades, I propose that we honour his memory by rising. (*All rise.*)

Comrades, we are opening our Party Congress at a very difficult, complicated and peculiar stage in the Russian and in the world proletarian revolution. In the first period after the October Revolution the forces of the Party and of the Soviet government were almost entirely absorbed by the tasks of direct defence, of offering direct resistance to our enemies, the bourgeoisie at home and abroad, who could not reconcile themselves to the idea that the socialist republic could exist for any length of time. We nevertheless gradually began to consolidate our position and the tasks of construction, organisational tasks, began to come to the fore. I think that this work of construction and organisation should be the keynote of our Congress. The programme problems which, from the standpoint of theory present a big difficulty and are in the main problems of our development, and those that have a special place on the Congress agenda—the organisational question, the question of the Red Army and, particularly, the question of work in the countryside—all require us to focus and concentrate our attention on the

main question, which is a very difficult but gratifying one for socialists to grapple with, namely, the question of organisation. It must be particularly emphasised here that one of the most difficult problems of communist development, in a country of small peasant farms, one that we must deal with right now, is *the problem of our attitude towards the middle peasants*.

Comrades, it was natural that in the first period, when we had to fight for the Soviet Republic's right to existence, this question should not have been pushed into the foreground on an extensive scale. The relentless war against the rural bourgeoisie and the kulaks gave prominence to the organisation of the rural proletariat and semi-proletariat. But by its next step the Party, which wants to lay the sound foundations of communist society, must take up the task of correctly defining our attitude towards the middle peasants. This is a problem of a higher order. We could not present it on an extensive scale until we had made secure the basis for the existence of the Soviet Republic. This problem is a more complicated one and it involves defining our attitude towards a numerous and strong section of the population. This attitude cannot be defined simply by the answer—struggle or support. As regards the bourgeoisie our task is defined by the words "struggle", "suppression", and as regards the rural proletariat and semi-proletariat our task is defined by the words "our support", but this problem is undoubtedly more complicated. On this point, the socialists, the best representatives of socialism in the old days, when they still believed in the revolution and faithfully adhered to its theory and ideals, talked about *neutralising the peasantry*, i.e., making the middle peasants a social stratum which, if it did not actively help the proletarian revolution, at least would not hinder it, that would remain neutral and not go over to the side of our enemies. This abstract, theoretical formulation of the problem is quite clear but is inadequate. We have reached the stage of socialist development when we must draw up definite and detailed rules and regulations which have been tested by practical experience in the rural districts to guide us in our efforts to place our relations with the middle peasants *on the basis of a firm alliance* and so preclude the pos-

sibility of a repetition of those mistakes and blunders we have repeatedly made in the past. These blunders estranged the middle peasants from us, although we of the Communist Party, the leading party, were the first who helped the Russian peasants to throw off the yoke of the landowners and establish real democracy, which gave us every ground for counting on their complete confidence. This is not the type of problem that calls for ruthless, swift suppression and attack, it is more complicated. But I shall allow myself to say confidently that after our twelve months of preliminary work we shall be able to cope with this problem.

A few words about our international situation. Comrades, you are all, of course, aware that the founding of the Third, Communist International in Moscow is an event of the greatest significance insofar as our position in the world is concerned. We still have confronting us a vast, real and well-armed military force—all the strongest powers of the world. Nevertheless, we can confidently say to ourselves that what outwardly seems to be a gigantic force, and which physically is immeasurably stronger than we are, has been shaken. It is no longer a force. It no longer has its former stability. Therefore there is nothing utopian in our aim and in the task we set ourselves—to be victorious in the struggle against this giant. On the contrary, although we are now artificially cut off from the whole world, the newspapers every day report the growth of the revolutionary movement in all countries. Moreover, we know, we see, that this growing movement is assuming the Soviet form. And this is a guarantee that in establishing the Soviet government we discovered the *international, world form of the dictatorship of the proletariat*. We are firmly convinced that the proletariat all over the world has taken this path of struggle, the creation of these forms of proletarian rule, the rule of the workers and of the working people in general, and that no power on earth can halt the progress of the world communist revolution towards the world Soviet republic. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Comrades, permit me now on behalf of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party to declare the Eighth Congress open and proceed to the election of the presidium.

2

REPORT OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
MARCH 18

(Stormy prolonged applause. Cries of "Long live Ilyich!" "Long live Comrade Lenin!")

Comrades, permit me to begin with the political report of the Central Committee. To present a report on the Central Committee's political activities since the last Congress is tantamount to presenting a report on the whole of our revolution; and I think that everybody will agree that not only is it impossible for one individual to perform such a task in so short a time, but that it is, in general, beyond the powers of one individual. I have therefore decided to confine myself to those points which, in my opinion, are particularly important in the history of what our Party was called upon to do during this period and in the light of our present tasks. I must say that at a time like this I find it beyond my powers to devote myself exclusively to history, to reviewing the past without bearing in mind the present and the future.

To begin with foreign policy, it goes without saying that the outstanding features here were our relations with German imperialism and the Brest peace. I think it is worth while dwelling on this question, because its importance is not merely historical. I think that the proposal the Soviet government made to the Allied powers, or, to put it more correctly, our government's consent to the well-known proposal for a conference to be held on Princes Islands²⁴—I think that this proposal, and our reply, reflect, in some respects, and in important respects at that, the relations with imperialism that we established at the time of the

Brest peace. That is why I think it important to deal with the history of this matter in view of the rapidity with which events are occurring.

When the Brest peace was decided on, the Soviet system and even Party development were still in the initial stages. You know that at that time our Party as a whole still possessed too little experience to determine, even approximately, how fast we should travel the path we had chosen. The chaotic conditions that, as you know, we had to take over from the past made it extremely difficult at that time to survey events and obtain an exact picture of what was going on. Moreover, our extreme isolation from Western Europe and all other countries deprived us of the objective material necessary to assess the possible rapidity or the ways in which the proletarian revolution in the West would develop. This complex situation made the question of the Brest peace a matter of no little dissension in the ranks of our Party.

But events have proved that this enforced retreat before German imperialism, which had taken cover behind an extremely oppressive, outrageous and predatory peace, was the only correct move in the relations between the young socialist republic and world imperialism (one half of world imperialism). At that time we, who had just overthrown the landowners and the bourgeoisie in Russia, had absolutely no choice but to retreat before the forces of world imperialism. Those who condemned this retreat from the point of view of a revolutionary were actually supporting a fundamentally wrong and non-Marxist position. They had forgotten the conditions, the long and strenuous process of development of the Kerensky period, and the enormous preparatory work done in the Soviets before we reached the stage when, in October, after the severe July defeats, after the Kornilov revolt, the vast mass of working people was at last ready and determined to overthrow the bourgeoisie, and when the organised material forces necessary for this purpose had become available. Naturally, anything like this was then out of the question on an international scale. In view of this, the fight against world imperialism had this aim—to continue the work of disintegrating imperialism and of enlightening and uniting the working class,

which had everywhere begun to stir, but whose actions have still not become completely definite.

Hence, the only correct policy was the one we adopted in respect of the Brest peace, although, of course, at the time, that policy intensified the enmity of a number of petty-bourgeois elements, who are not by any means necessarily hostile to socialism under all conditions, or in all countries. In this respect history offered us a lesson which we must learn thoroughly, for there can be no doubt that we shall often be called upon to apply it. This lesson is that the attitude the party of the proletariat should adopt towards the petty-bourgeois democratic parties, towards those elements, strata, groups and classes which are particularly strong and numerous in Russia, and which exist in all countries, constitutes an extremely complex and difficult problem. Petty-bourgeois elements vacillate between the old society and the new. They cannot be the motive force of either the old society, or the new. On the other hand, they are not bound to the old society to the same degree as the landowners and the bourgeoisie. Patriotism is a sentiment bound up with the economic conditions of life of precisely the small proprietors. The bourgeoisie is more international than the small proprietors. We came up against this fact during the period of the Brest peace, when the Soviet government set a higher value on the world dictatorship of the proletariat and the world revolution than on all national sacrifices, burdensome as they were. This compelled us to enter into a violent and ruthless clash with the petty-bourgeois elements. At that time a number of those elements joined forces with the bourgeoisie and the landowners against us, although, subsequently, they began to waver.

The question that several comrades have raised here as to our attitude towards the petty-bourgeois parties is dealt with extensively in our programme and will, in fact, crop up in the discussion of every point of the agenda. In the course of our revolution this question has ceased to be an abstract and general one, and has become concrete. At the time of the Brest peace our duty as internationalists was at all costs to help the proletarian elements to strengthen and consolidate their positions and this drove the petty-

bourgeois parties away from us. After the German revolution, as we know, the petty-bourgeois elements again began to vacillate. Those events opened the eyes of many who, as the proletarian revolution was maturing, had assessed the situation from the point of view of the old type of patriotism, and had assessed it not only in a non-socialist way, but, in general, incorrectly. At the present time, owing to the difficult food situation and the war which we are still waging against the Entente, a wave of vacillation is again sweeping through the petty-bourgeois democrats. We have been obliged to reckon with these vacillations before; but now we must all learn a tremendously important lesson, namely, that situations never repeat themselves in exactly the same form. The new situation is far more complex. It can be properly assessed, and our policy will be correct, if we draw on the experience of the Brest peace. When we consented to the proposal for a conference on Princes Islands we knew that we were consenting to an extremely harsh peace. On the other hand, however, we now know better how the tide of proletarian revolution is rising in Western Europe, how unrest is changing into conscious discontent, and how the latter is giving rise to a world, Soviet, proletarian movement. At that time we were groping, guessing when the revolution in Europe might break out—we presumed, on the basis of our theoretical conviction, that the revolution must take place—but today we have a number of facts showing how the revolution is maturing in other countries and how the movement began. That is why, in relation to Western Europe, in relation to the Entente countries, we have, or shall have, to repeat a good deal of what we did at the time of the Brest peace. It will be much easier for us to do this now that we have the experience of Brest. When our Central Committee discussed the question of participating in a conference on Princes Islands together with the Whites—which in fact amounted to the annexation of all the territory the Whites then occupied—this question of an armistice did not evoke a single voice of protest among the proletariat; and that also was the attitude of our Party. At any rate, I did not hear of any dissatisfaction, or indignation, from any quarter. The reason for this was that our lesson in international politics had borne fruit.

Insofar as concerns the petty-bourgeois elements, the problem facing the Party has not yet been fully solved. On a number of questions, in fact on all the questions on the agenda, we have, during the past year, laid the foundation for a correct solution of this problem, particularly in relation to the middle peasants. In theory we agree that the middle peasants are not our enemies, that they need special treatment, and that in their case the situations will vary in accordance with numerous circumstances attending the revolution, in particular, the answer to the question "For or against patriotism?" For us such questions are of second-rate importance, even of third-rate importance; but the petty bourgeoisie is completely blinded by them. Furthermore, all these elements waver in the struggle and become absolutely spineless. They do not know what they want, and are incapable of defending their position. Here we need extremely flexible and extremely cautious tactics, for sometimes it is necessary to give with one hand and take away with the other. The petty-bourgeois elements and not we are to blame for this, for they cannot make up their minds. We can see this in practice now. Only today we read in the newspapers what the German Independents,²⁵ who possess such strong forces as Kautsky and Hilferding, have set out to attain. You know that they wanted to incorporate the workers' councils in the constitution of the German democratic republic, i.e., marry the Constituent Assembly to the dictatorship of the proletariat. From our point of view this is such a mockery of common sense in our revolution, the German revolution, the Hungarian revolution and the maturing Polish revolution, that we can only express our amazement. It must be said that such vacillating elements are to be found in the most advanced countries. Educated, well-informed, intelligent people, even in such an advanced capitalist country as Germany, are sometimes a hundred times more muddle-headed and hysterical than our backward petty bourgeoisie. In this there is a lesson for Russia in respect of the petty-bourgeois parties and the middle peasants. For a long time we shall have a difficult, double problem. For a long time these parties are bound to take one step forward and two steps back because their economic status compels them to do so, and

because their acceptance of socialism is not due to a definite conviction that the bourgeois system is worthless. We cannot expect them to be loyal to socialism, and it would be absurd to rely on their socialist convictions. They will support socialism only when they are convinced that there is no other way out, when the bourgeoisie is finally defeated and smashed.

I am unable to give you a systematic summary of the experience of the past year and have glanced at the past only in the light of what is required for our policy tomorrow and the day after. The chief lesson is that we must be extremely cautious in our attitude towards the middle peasants and the petty bourgeoisie. The experience of the past demands it, we know it from the experience of Brest. We shall have to change our line of conduct very often, and this may appear strange and incomprehensible to the casual observer. "How is that?" he will say. "Yesterday you were making promises to the petty bourgeoisie, while today Dzerzhinsky announces that the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks will be stood against the wall. What a contradiction!" Yes, it is a contradiction. But the conduct of the petty-bourgeois democrats themselves is contradictory: they do not know where to sit, and try to sit between two stools, jump from one to the other and fall now to the right and now to the left. We have changed our tactics towards them, and whenever they turn towards us we say "Welcome" to them. We have not the slightest intention of expropriating the middle peasants; we certainly do not want to use force against the petty-bourgeois democrats. We say to them, "You are not a serious enemy. Our enemy is the bourgeoisie. But if you join forces with them, we shall be obliged to apply the measures of the proletarian dictatorship to you, too."

I shall now deal with questions of internal development, briefly touch on the main features which characterise our political experience and sum up the political activities of the Central Committee during this period. These political activities of the Central Committee manifested themselves daily in questions of immense importance. Were it not for the fact that we worked together so well and so harmoniously, as I have already told you, we would not have been able to act

as we did, we would not have been able to solve these urgent problems. As to the question of the Red Army, which is now rousing so much discussion, and which stands as a special item on the agenda of this Congress, we adopted a host of minor, individual decisions which the Central Committee of our Party submitted to and got carried in the Council of People's Commissars and the All-Russia Central Executive Committee. A still larger number of important individual assignments were made by the respective People's Commissars, all of which systematically and consistently pursued one common line.

The organisation of a Red Army was an entirely new question which had never been dealt with before, even theoretically. Marx once said that it is to the credit of the Paris Communards that they carried into effect decisions which were not borrowed from some preconceived theories, but were dictated by actual necessity.²⁶ Marx said this about the Communards in a somewhat ironical vein because there were two predominant trends in the Commune—the Blanquists and the Proudhonists—and both were compelled to act contrary to their doctrines. We, however, acted in conformity with the tenets of Marxism. At the same time, the political activities of the Central Committee in each concrete case were determined entirely by what was absolutely indispensable. We were often obliged to feel our way. This will be strongly emphasised by any historian capable of presenting an integrated picture of the activities of the Central Committee of the Party and of the Soviet government during the past year. This fact becomes all the more striking when we try to embrace our past experience in a single glance. But this did not deter us in the least even on October 10, 1917, when the question of seizing power was decided. We did not doubt that we should have to experiment; as Comrade Trotsky expressed it. We undertook a task which nobody in the world has ever attempted on so large a scale.

This is also true of the Red Army. When the war drew to a close the army began to break up, and many people thought at the time that this was a purely Russian phenomenon. But we see that the Russian revolution was in fact the dress rehearsal, or one of the rehearsals, for the world proletarian revolution. When we discussed the Treaty of Brest,

when the question of peace arose early in January 1918, we did not yet know when, and in which other countries, armies would begin to disintegrate. We proceeded from experiment to experiment; we endeavoured to create a volunteer army, feeling our way, testing the ground and experimenting to find a solution to the problem in the given situation. And the nature of the problem was clear. Unless we defended the socialist republic by force of arms, we could not exist. A ruling class would never surrender its power to an oppressed class. And the latter would have to prove in practice that it is capable not only of overthrowing the exploiters, but also of organising its self-defence and of staking everything on it. We have always said that there are different kinds of wars. We condemned the *imperialist* war, but we did not reject *war in general*. Those who accused us of being militarists were hopelessly muddled. And when in the report of the Berne Conference of yellow socialists I read that Kautsky had said that the Bolsheviks had introduced not socialism but militarism, I smiled and shrugged my shoulders. As if there was ever a big revolution in history that was not connected with war! Of course not! We are living not merely in a state, but *in a system of states*, and it is inconceivable for the Soviet Republic to exist alongside of the imperialist states for any length of time. One or the other must triumph in the end. And before that end comes there will have to be a series of frightful collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states. If the ruling class, the proletariat, wants to hold power, it must, therefore, prove its ability to do so by its military organisation. How was a class which had hitherto served as cannon-fodder for the military commanders of the ruling imperialist class to create its own commanders? How was it to solve the problem of combining the enthusiasm, the new revolutionary creative spirit of the oppressed and the employment of the store of the bourgeois science and technology of militarism in their worst forms without which this class would not be able to master modern technology and modern methods of warfare?

Here we were faced with a problem which a year's experience has now summed up for us. When we included the question of bourgeois specialists in the revolutionary pro-

gramme of our Party, we summed up the Party's practical experience in one of the most important questions. As far as I remember the earlier teachers of socialism, who foresaw a great deal of what would take place in the future socialist revolution and discerned many of its features, never expressed an opinion on this question. It did not exist for them, for it arose only when we proceeded to create a Red Army. That meant creating an army filled with enthusiasm out of an oppressed class which had been used as mere cannon-fodder, and it meant compelling that army to utilise all that was most coercive and abhorrent in what we had inherited from capitalism.

This contradiction, with which we are faced in connection with the Red Army, faces us in every organisational field. Take the question which engaged our attention most of all, namely, the transition from workers' control to workers' management in industry. Following the decrees and decisions passed by the Council of People's Commissars and local Soviet authorities—all of which contributed to our political experience in this field—actually the only thing left for the Central Committee to do was to sum up. In a matter like this it was scarcely able to give a lead in the true sense of the word. One has only to recall how clumsy, immature and casual were our first decrees and decisions on the subject of workers' control of industry. We thought that it was an easy matter; practice showed that it was necessary to build, but we gave no answer whatever to the question as to *how* to build. Every nationalised factory, every branch of nationalised industry, transport, and particularly railway transport—that most striking example of highly centralised capitalist machinery built on the basis of large-scale engineering, and most vital for the state—all embodied the concentrated experience of capitalism, and created immense difficulties for us.

We are still far from having overcome these difficulties. At first we regarded them in an entirely abstract way, like revolutionary preachers, who had absolutely no idea of how to set to work. There were lots of people, of course, who accused us—and all the socialists and Social-Democrats are accusing us today—of having undertaken this task without knowing how to finish it. But these accusations

are ridiculous, made by people who lack the spark of life. As if one can set out to make a great revolution and know beforehand how it is to be completed! Such knowledge cannot be derived from books and our decision could spring only from the experience of the masses. And I say that it is to our credit that amidst incredible difficulties we undertook to solve a problem with which until then we were only half familiar, that we inspired the proletarian masses to display their own initiative, that we nationalised the industrial enterprises, and so forth. I remember that in Smolny we passed as many as ten or twelve decrees at one sitting. That was an expression of our determination and desire to stimulate the spirit of experiment and initiative among the proletarian masses. We now have experience. Now, we have passed, or are about to pass, from workers' control to workers' management of industry. Instead of being absolutely helpless as we were before, we are now armed with experience, and as far as this is possible, we have summed it up in our programme. We shall have to discuss this in detail when we deal with the question of organisation. We would not have been able to do this work had we not had the assistance and collaboration of the comrades from the trade unions.

In Western Europe the situation is different. There our comrades regard the trade unions as an evil, because they are commanded so completely by yellow representatives of the old type of socialism that the Communists do not see that much advantage is to be gained from their support. Many West-European Communists, even Rosa Luxemburg, are advocating the dissolution of the trade unions.²⁷ That shows how much more difficult this problem is in Western Europe. In this country we could not have held out for a single month had it not been for the support of the trade unions. In this we have the experience of a vast amount of practical work, which enables us to set to work to solve extremely difficult problems.

Take the question of the specialists which faces us at every turn, which arises in connection with every appointment, and which the leaders of our economy, and the Central Committee of the Party, are continually having to face. Under existing conditions the Central Committee of the

Party cannot perform its functions if it adheres to hard and fast forms. If we could not appoint comrades able to work independently in their particular fields, we should be unable to function at all. It was only thanks to the fact that we had organisers like Yakov Sverdlov that we were able to work under war conditions without a single conflict worth noting. And in this work we were obliged to accept the assistance offered us by people who possessed knowledge acquired in the past.

In particular, take the administration of the War Department. We could not have solved that problem had we not trusted the General Staff and the big specialists in organisation. There were differences of opinion among us on particular questions, but fundamentally, there was no room for doubt. We availed ourselves of the assistance of bourgeois experts who were thoroughly imbued with the bourgeois mentality, who were disloyal to us, and will remain disloyal to us for many years to come. Nevertheless, the idea that we can build communism with the aid of pure Communists, without the assistance of bourgeois experts, is childish. We have been steeled in the struggle, we have the forces, and we are united; and we must proceed with our organisational work, making use of the knowledge and experience of those experts. This is an indispensable condition, without which socialism cannot be built. Socialism cannot be built unless we utilise the heritage of capitalist culture. The only material we have to build communism with is what has been left us by capitalism.

We must now build in a practical way, and we have to build communist society with the aid of our enemies. This looks like a contradiction, an irreconcilable contradiction, perhaps. As a matter of fact, this is the only way the problem of building communism can be solved. And reviewing our experience, glancing at the way this problem confronts us every day, surveying the practical activities of the Central Committee, it seems to me that, in the main, our Party has found a solution to this problem. We have encountered immense difficulties, but this was the only way the problem could be solved. The bourgeois experts must be hemmed in by our organised, constructive and united activities so that they will be compelled to fall in line with the proletar-

iat, no matter how much they resist and fight at every step. We must set them to work as a technical and cultural force so as to preserve them and to transform an uncultured and barbarian capitalist country into a cultured, communist country. And it seems to me that during the past year we have learned how to build, that we have taken the right road, and shall not now be diverted from this road.

I should also like to deal briefly with the food question and the question of the countryside. Food has always been our most difficult problem. In a country where the proletariat could only assume power with the aid of the peasantry, where the proletariat had to serve as the agent of a petty-bourgeois revolution, our revolution was largely a *bourgeois* revolution until the Poor Peasants' Committees were set up, i.e., until the summer and even the autumn of 1918. We are not afraid to admit that. We accomplished the October Revolution so easily because the peasants as a whole supported us and fought the landowners for they saw that as far as they were concerned we would go the limit, because we were giving legal effect to what the Socialist-Revolutionary newspapers had been printing, to that which the cowardly petty bourgeoisie had promised, but could not carry out. But from the moment the Poor Peasants' Committees began to be organised, our revolution became a *proletarian* revolution. We were faced with a problem which even now has not been fully solved, and it is extremely important that we have put it on a practical footing. The Poor Peasants' Committees were a transition stage. The first decree on their organisation was passed by the Soviet government on the recommendation of Comrade Tsyurupa, who at that time was in charge of food affairs. We have to save the non-agricultural population that was tormented by hunger. That could be done only with the aid of Poor Peasants' Committees, which were proletarian organisations. And only when the October Revolution began to spread to the rural districts and was consummated, in the summer of 1918, did we acquire a real proletarian base; only then did our revolution *become a proletarian revolution in fact*, and not merely in our proclamations, promises and declarations.

We have not yet solved the problem that faces our Party of creating the necessary forms of organisation of the rural

proletariat and semi-proletariat. Recently I visited Petrograd and attended the First Congress of Farm Labourers of Petrograd Gubernia.²⁸ I then saw how we were feeling our way in this matter, but I think that progress will undoubtedly be made. I must say that the principal lesson we learned from our work of political leadership in the past year was that we must find organisational support in this field. We took a step in this direction when we formed the Poor Peasants' Committees, held new elections to the Soviets and revised our food policy, where we had encountered immense difficulties. In those outlying parts of Russia which are now becoming Soviet—the Ukraine and the Don region—this policy may have to be modified. It would be a mistake to draw up stereotyped decrees for all parts of Russia; it would be a mistake for the Bolshevik Communists, the Soviet officials in the Ukraine and the Don, to apply these decrees to other regions wholesale, without discrimination. We shall meet with no few peculiar situations; we shall under no circumstances bind ourselves to uniform patterns; we shall not decide once and for all that our experience, the experience of Central Russia, must be applied in its entirety to every region. We have only just taken up the problems of real development; we are only just taking the first steps in this direction. An immense field of work is opening before us.

I said that the first decisive step the Soviet government took was to create the Poor Peasants' Committees. This measure was carried out by our food supply officials and was dictated by necessity. But in order to complete our tasks we must have something more than temporary organisations like these Committees. Alongside the Soviets we have the trade unions, which we are using as a school for training the backward masses. The top layer of workers who actually administered Russia during the past year, who bore the brunt of the work in carrying out our policy, and who were our mainstay—this layer in Russia is an extremely thin one. We have become convinced of that, we are feeling it. If a future historian ever collects information on the groups which administered Russia during these seventeen months, on how many hundreds, or how many thousands of individuals were engaged in this work and

bore the entire, incredible burden of administering the country—nobody will believe that it was done by so few people. The number was so small because there were so few intelligent, educated and capable political leaders in Russia. This layer was a thin one in Russia, and in the course of the recent struggle it overtaxed its strength, became overworked, did more than its strength allowed. I think that at this Congress we shall devise practical means of utilising ever new forces on a mass scale in industry and—what is more important—in the rural districts, of enlisting in Soviet activities workers and peasants who are on, or even below, the average level. Without their assistance on a mass scale further activities, I think, will be impossible.

Since my time has almost expired, I want to say only a few words about our attitude towards the middle peasants. The attitude we should take towards the middle peasants was, in principle, quite clear to us even before the revolution. The task that faced us was to *neutralise* them. At a meeting in Moscow where the question of our attitude towards petty-bourgeois parties was discussed, I quoted the exact words of Engels, who not only pointed out that the middle peasants were our allies, but also expressed the view that it would be possible, perhaps, to dispense with coercion, with repressive measures even as regards the big peasants.²⁹ In Russia, this assumption did not prove correct; we were, are, and will be, in a state of open civil war with the kulaks. This is inevitable. We have seen it in practice. But owing to the inexperience of our Soviet officials and to the difficulties of the problem, the blows which were intended for the kulaks very frequently fell on the middle peasants. In this respect we have sinned a great deal, but the experience we have gained will enable us to do everything to avoid this in future. Such is the problem that now faces us not theoretically but practically. You are well aware that the problem is a difficult one. We have no advantages to offer the middle peasant; he is a materialist, a practical man, who demands definite material advantages, which at present we are not in a position to offer and which the country will have to dispense with for, perhaps, many months of a severe struggle that now promises to end in complete victory. But there is a good deal we can do in our

practical administrative work—we can improve our administrative machinery and eliminate a host of abuses. The line of our Party, which has not done enough to form a bloc, an alliance, an agreement with the middle peasants, can and must be corrected.

This, in brief, is all I can say at present about the economic and political work of the Central Committee during the past year. I must now very briefly deal with the second part of the duty entrusted to me by the Central Committee—to make the Central Committee report on organisation. This duty could have been performed in the way it should really be performed only by Yakov Mikhailovich Sverdlov, who had been appointed to make the report on this question on behalf of the Central Committee. His unbelievably phenomenal memory, in which he retained the greater part of his report, and his personal acquaintance with the work of organisation in the various localities would have made it possible for him to deliver this report better than anybody else. I am unable to replace him even in one-hundredth part, for in this work we were obliged to rely, and were absolutely justified in relying, entirely on Comrade Sverdlov, who very often adopted decisions on his own responsibility.

I can give you short excerpts from the written reports now available. The Secretariat of the Central Committee, which was unable to complete its work in time, has most definitely promised that the written reports will be ready for printing next week, that they will be mimeographed and distributed to the Congress delegates. They will supplement the brief, fragmentary remarks which I can make here. In the material of the report available at present in writing, we find, first of all figures relating to the number of incoming documents: 1,483 in December 1918, 1,537 in January 1919 and 1,840 in February. The distribution of these documents in percentages is given, but I will take the liberty of not reading this. Comrades who are interested will see from the report when distributed that, for instance, 490 persons visited the Secretariat in November. And the comrades who handed me the report say it can be only half the number of visitors the Secretariat dealt with, because dozens of delegates were received daily by Comrade Sverdlov,

and more than half of these were probably not Soviet but Party officials.

I must draw attention to the report on the activities of the Federation of Foreign Groups.³⁰ I know something of the work in this field only insofar as I have been able to cast a glance at the material on the foreign groups. At first there were seven such groups, now there are nine. Comrades living in purely Great-Russian districts, who have not had the opportunity of becoming directly acquainted with these groups and who have not seen the reports in the newspapers, will please read the excerpts from the newspapers, which I shall take the liberty of not reading in full. I must say that here we see the real foundation of what we have done for the Third International. The Third International was founded in Moscow at a short congress, and Comrade Zinoviev will make a detailed report on this and on everything proposed by the Central Committee on all questions concerning the International. The fact that we succeeded in doing so much in so short a time at the congress of Communists in Moscow is due to the tremendous preparatory work that was performed by the Central Committee of our Party and by the organiser of the congress, Comrade Sverdlov. Propaganda and agitation were carried on among foreigners in Russia and a number of foreign groups were organised. Dozens of members of these groups were fully acquainted with the main plans and with the guiding lines of general policy. Hundreds of thousands of war prisoners from armies which the imperialists had created solely in their own interests, upon returning to Hungary, Germany and Austria, thoroughly infected those countries with the germs of Bolshevism. And the fact that groups and parties sympathising with us predominate in those countries is due to work which is not visible on the surface and which is only briefly summed up in the report on the organisational activities of the foreign groups in Russia; it constituted one of the most significant features in the activities of the Russian Communist Party as one of the units of the world communist party.

Further, the material handed to me contains data on the reports received by the Central Committee, and the organisations from which they were received. And here our Russian lack of organisational ability stands out in all

its shameful wretchedness. Reports were received regularly from organisations in four gubernias, irregularly from fourteen, and isolated reports from sixteen. The gubernias in question are enumerated in the list, which permit me not to read. Of course, this lack of organisational ability, these extreme organisational drawbacks, are very largely, but not entirely, to be explained by the conditions of civil war. Least of all should we use this to hide behind, to excuse and defend ourselves. Organisational activity was never a strong point with the Russians in general, nor with the Bolsheviks in particular; nevertheless the chief problem of the proletarian revolution is *that of organisation*. It is not without reason that the question of organisation is here assigned a most prominent place. This is a thing we must fight for, and fight for with firmness and determination, using every means at our disposal. We can do nothing here except by prolonged education and re-education. This is a field in which revolutionary violence and dictatorship can be applied only by way of abuse and I make bold to warn you against such abuse. Revolutionary violence and dictatorship are excellent things when applied in the right way and against the right people. But they cannot be applied in the field of organisation. We have by no means solved this problem of education, re-education and prolonged organisational work, and we must tackle it systematically.

We have here a detailed financial report. Of the various items, the largest is in connection with workers' book publishing and with newspapers: 1,000,000, again 1,000,000 and again 1,000,000—3,000,000; Party organisations, 2,800,000; editorial expenses, 3,600,000. More detailed figures are given in this report, which will be duplicated and distributed to all the delegates. Meanwhile the comrades can get their information from the representatives of the groups. Permit me not to read these figures. The comrades who submitted the reports gave in them what is most important and illustrative—the general results of the propaganda work performed in the sphere of publication. The Kommunist Publishing House released sixty-two books. A net profit of 2,000,000 in 1918 was earned by the newspaper *Pravda*, 25,000,000 copies of which were issued during the year. The newspaper *Bednota*⁸¹ earned a net profit of 2,370,000

and 33,000,000 copies were issued. The comrades of the Organising Bureau of the Central Committee have promised to rearrange the detailed figures they possess in such a way as to give at least two comparable criteria. It will then be clear what vast educational work is being performed by the Party, which for the first time in history is using modern large-scale capitalist printing equipment in the interests of the workers and peasants and not in the interests of the bourgeoisie. We have been accused thousands and millions of times of having violated the freedom of the press and of having renounced democracy. Our accusers call it democracy when the capitalists can buy out the press and the rich can use the press in their own interests. We call that plutocracy and not democracy. Everything that bourgeois culture has created for the purpose of deceiving the people and defending the capitalists we have taken from them in order to satisfy the political needs of the workers and peasants. And in this respect we have done more than any socialist party has done in a quarter of a century, or in half a century. Nevertheless, we have done far too little of what has to be done.

The last item in the material handed to me by the Bureau concerns circular letters. Fourteen of these were issued, and the comrades who are not acquainted with them, or who are not sufficiently acquainted with them, are invited to read them. Of course, the Central Committee was far from being as active as it should have been in this respect, but you must bear in mind the conditions under which we worked, when we were obliged to give political instructions on a number of questions every day, and only in exceptional, even rare, cases were we able to do so through the Political Bureau or the plenary meeting of the Central Committee. Under such circumstances it was impossible for us to send out frequent political circulars.

I repeat that we, as the militant organ of a militant party, in time of civil war, cannot work in any other way. If we did, it would be only a half-measure, or a parliament, and in the era of dictatorship questions cannot be settled, nor can the Party, or the Soviet organisations, be directed by parliamentary means. Comrades, now that we have taken over the bourgeois printing-presses and papers the importance of the Central Committee's circular letters is not so great.

We send out in the form of circular letters only such instructions as cannot be published, for in our activities, which were conducted publicly in spite of their vast dimensions, underground work nevertheless remained, still remains, and will remain. We were never afraid of being reproached for our underground methods and secrecy, but on the contrary were proud of them. And when we found ourselves in a situation in which, after overthrowing our bourgeoisie, we were faced with the hostility of the European bourgeoisie, secrecy remained a feature of our activities and underground methods a feature of our work.

With this, comrades, I conclude my report. (*Applause.*)

3

REPORT ON THE PARTY PROGRAMME
MARCH 19

(*Applause.*) Comrades, according to the division of subjects agreed on between Comrade Bukharin and myself, it is my task to explain the point of view of the commission on a number of concrete and most disputed points, or points which interest the Party most at the present time.

I shall begin by dealing briefly with the points which Comrade Bukharin touched on at the end of his report as points of dispute among us in the commission. The first relates to the structure of the preamble to the programme. In my opinion, Comrade Bukharin did not quite correctly explain here the reason the majority on the commission rejected all attempts to draw up the programme in such a way that everything relating to the old capitalism would be deleted. By the way Comrade Bukharin spoke he sometimes seemed to imply that the majority on the commission was apprehensive of what might be said about this, apprehensive that they would be accused of insufficient respect for the past. There can be no doubt that when the position of the majority is presented in this way it seems rather ridiculous. But this is very far from the truth. The majority rejected these attempts because they would be wrong. They would not correspond to the real state of affairs. Pure imperialism, without the fundamental basis of capitalism, has never existed, does not exist anywhere, and never will exist. This is an incorrect generalisation of everything that was said of the syndicates, cartels, trusts and finance capitalism, when finance capitalism was depicted as though it had none of the foundations of the old capitalism under it.

That is wrong. It would be particularly wrong for the era of the imperialist war and for the era following the imperialist war. Engels in his time, in one of his reflections on the future war, wrote that it would involve much more severe devastation than that caused by the Thirty Years' War; that in a large degree mankind would be reduced to savagery, that our artificial apparatus of trade and industry would collapse.³² At the beginning of the war the traitor-socialists and opportunists boasted of the tenacity of capitalism and derided the "fanatics or semi-anarchists", as they called us. "Look," they said, "these predictions have not come true. Events have shown that they were true only of a very small number of countries and for a very short period of time!" And now, not only in Russia and not only in Germany, but even in the victor countries, a gigantic collapse of modern capitalism is beginning, a collapse, so gigantic that it frequently removes this artificial apparatus and restores the old capitalism.

When Comrade Bukharin stated that an attempt might be made to present an integral picture of the collapse of capitalism and imperialism, we objected to it in the commission, and I must object to it here. Just try it, and you will see that you will not succeed. Comrade Bukharin made one such attempt in the commission, and himself gave it up. I am absolutely convinced that if anybody could do this, it is Comrade Bukharin, who has studied this question very extensively and thoroughly. I assert that such an attempt cannot be successful, because the task is a wrong one. We in Russia are now experiencing the consequences of the imperialist war and the beginning of the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the same time, in a number of the regions of Russia, cut off from each other more than formerly, we frequently see a regeneration of capitalism and the development of its early stage. That is something we cannot escape. If the programme were to be written in the way Comrade Bukharin wanted, it would be a wrong programme. At best, it would be a reproduction of all the best that has been said of finance capitalism and imperialism, but it would not reproduce reality, precisely because this reality is not integral. A programme made up of heterogeneous parts is inelegant (but that, of course, is not important), but any

other programme would simply be incorrect. However unpleasant it may be, whatever it may lack in proportion, we shall be unable for a long time to escape this heterogeneity, this necessity of constructing from different materials. When we do escape it, we shall create another programme. But then we shall already be living in a socialist society. It would be ridiculous to pretend that things will be then what they are now.

We are living at a time when a number of the most elementary and fundamental manifestations of capitalism have been revived. Take, for instance, the collapse of transport, which we are experiencing so well, or rather so badly, in our own case. This same thing is taking place in other countries, too, even in the victor countries. And what does the collapse of transport mean under the imperialist system? A return to the most primitive forms of commodity production. We know very well what our profiteers or bagmen are. This latter word, I think, has up to now been unknown to foreigners. And now? Speak to the comrades who have arrived for the Congress of the Third International. It turns out that similar words are beginning to appear in both Germany and Switzerland. And this is a category you cannot fit into any dictatorship of the proletariat; you have to return to the very dawn of capitalist society and commodity production.

To escape from this sad reality by creating a smooth and integral programme is to escape into something ethereal that is not of this world, to write a wrong programme. And it is by no means reverence for the past, as Comrade Bukharin politely hinted, which induced us here to insert passages from the old programme. What appeared to be implied was this: the programme was written in 1903 with the participation of Lenin; the programme is undoubtedly a bad one; but since old people love most of all to recall the past, in a new era a new programme has been drawn up which, out of reverence for the past, repeats the old programme. If it were so, such cranks ought to be laughed at. I assert that it is not so. The capitalism described in 1903 remains in existence in 1919 in the Soviet proletarian republic just because of the disintegration of imperialism, because of its collapse. Capitalism of this kind can be found, for

instance, in Samara and in Vyatka gubernias, which are not very far from Moscow. In a period when civil war is rending the country, we shall not soon emerge from this situation, from this profiteering. That is why any other structure of the programme would be incorrect. We must state what actually exists; the programme must contain what is absolutely irrefutable, what has been established in fact. Only then will it be a Marxist programme.

Theoretically, Comrade Bukharin understands this perfectly and says that the programme must be concrete. But it is one thing to understand and another to act upon this understanding. Comrade Bukharin's concreteness is a bookish description of finance capitalism. In reality we have heterogeneous phenomena to deal with. In every agricultural gubernia there is free competition side by side with monopoly industry. Nowhere in the world has monopoly capitalism existed in a whole series of branches without free competition, nor will it exist. To write of such a system is to write of a system which is false and removed from reality. If Marx said of manufacture that it was a superstructure on mass small production,³³ imperialism and finance capitalism are a superstructure on the old capitalism. If its top is destroyed, the old capitalism is exposed. To maintain that there is such a thing as integral imperialism without the old capitalism is merely making the wish father to the thought.

This is a natural mistake, one very easily committed. And if we had an integral imperialism before us, which had entirely altered capitalism, our task would have been a hundred thousand times easier. It would have resulted in a system in which everything would be subordinated to finance capital alone. It would then only have remained to remove the top and to transfer what remained to the proletariat. That would have been extremely agreeable, but it is not so in reality. In reality the development is such that we have to act in an entirely different way. *Imperialism is a superstructure on capitalism*. When it collapses, we find ourselves dealing with the destruction of the top and the exposure of the foundation. That is why our programme, if it is to be a correct one, must state what actually exists. There is the old capitalism, which in a number of branches has grown to imperialism. Its tendencies are exclusively imperialist.

Fundamental questions can be examined only from the point of view of imperialism. There is not a single major question of home or foreign policy which could be settled in any way except from the point of view of this tendency. This is not what the programme now speaks about. In reality, there exists a vast subsoil of the old capitalism. There is the superstructure of imperialism, which led to the war, and from this war followed the beginnings of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is a phase you cannot escape. This fact is characteristic of the very rate of development of the proletarian revolution throughout the world, and will remain a fact for many years to come.

West-European revolutions will perhaps proceed more smoothly; nevertheless, very many years will be required for the reorganisation of the whole world, for the reorganisation of the majority of the countries. And this means that during the present transition period, we cannot escape this mosaic reality. We cannot cast aside this patchwork reality, however inelegant it may be; we cannot cast away one bit of it. If the programme were drawn up otherwise than it has been drawn up, it would be a wrong programme.

We say that we have arrived at the dictatorship. But we must know *how* we arrived at it. The past keeps fast hold of us, grasps us with a thousand tentacles, and does not allow us to take a single forward step, or compels us to take these steps badly in the way we are taking them. And we say that for the situation we are arriving at to be understood, it must be stated how we proceeded and what led us to the socialist revolution. We were led to it by imperialism, by capitalism in its early commodity production forms. All this must be understood, because it is only by reckoning with reality that we can solve such problems as, let us say, our attitude towards the middle peasants. And how is it, indeed, that there is such a category as a middle peasant in the era of purely imperialist capitalism? It did not exist even in countries that were simply capitalist. If we are to solve the problem of our attitude towards this almost medieval phenomenon (the middle peasants) purely from the point of view of imperialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat, we shall be absolutely unable to make ends meet, and we shall land in many difficulties. But if we are to change our attitude

towards the middle peasant—then also have the goodness to say in the theoretical part where he came from and what he is. He is a small commodity producer. And this is the ABC of capitalism, of which we must speak, because we have not yet grown out of it. To brush this aside and say, "Why should we study the ABC when we have studied finance capitalism?" would be highly frivolous.

I have to say the same thing about the *national question*. Here too the wish is father to the thought with Comrade Bukharin. He says that we must not recognise the right of nations to self-determination. A nation means the bourgeoisie together with the proletariat. And are we, the proletarians, to recognise the right to self-determination of the despised bourgeoisie? That is absolutely incompatible! Pardon me, it is compatible with what actually exists. If you eliminate this, the result will be sheer fantasy. You refer to the process of differentiation which is taking place within the nations, the process of separation of the proletariat from the bourgeoisie. But let us see how this differentiation will proceed.

Take, for instance, Germany, the model of an advanced capitalist country whose organisation of capitalism, finance capitalism, was superior to that of America. She was inferior in many other respects, in technical development and production and in the political sphere, but in respect of the organisation of finance capitalism, in respect of the transformation of monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism, Germany was superior to America. She is a model, it would seem. But what is taking place there? Has the German proletariat become differentiated from the bourgeoisie? No! It was reported that the majority of the workers are opposed to Scheidemann in only a few of the large towns. But how did this come about? It was owing to the alliance between the Spartacists and the thrice-accursed German Menshevik-Independents, who make a muddle of everything and want to wed the system of workers' councils to a Constituent Assembly! And this is what is taking place in that very Germany! And she, mark you, is an advanced country.

Comrade Bukharin says, "Why do we need the right of nations to self-determination?" I must repeat what I said opposing him in the summer of 1917, when he proposed to

delete the minimum programme and to leave only the maximum programme.³⁴ I then retorted, "Don't halloo until you're out of the wood." When we have conquered power, and even then only after waiting a while, we shall do this.³⁵ We have conquered power, we have waited a while, and now I am willing to do it. We have gone directly into socialist construction, we have beaten off the first assault that threatened us—now it will be in place. The same applies to the right of nations to self-determination. "I want to recognise only the right of the working classes to self-determination," says Comrade Bukharin. That is to say, you want to recognise something that has not been achieved in a single country except Russia. That is ridiculous.

Look at Finland; she is a democratic country, more developed, more cultured than we are. In Finland a process of separation, of the differentiation of the proletariat is taking a specific course, far more painful than was the case with us. The Finns have experienced the dictatorship of Germany; they are now experiencing the dictatorship of the Allied powers. But thanks to the fact that we have recognised the right of nations to self-determination, the process of differentiation has been facilitated there. I very well recall the scene when, at Smolny, I handed the act to Svinhufvud³⁶—which in Russian means "pighead"—the representative of the Finnish bourgeoisie, who played the part of a hangman. He amiably shook my hand, we exchanged compliments. How unpleasant that was! But it had to be done, because at that time the bourgeoisie were deceiving the people, were deceiving the working people by alleging that the Muscovites, the chauvinists, the Great Russians, wanted to crush the Finns. It had to be done.

Yesterday, was it not necessary to do the same thing in relation to the Bashkirian Republic?³⁷ When Comrade Bukharin said, "We can recognise this right in some cases", I even wrote down that he had included in the list the Hottentots, the Bushmen and the Indians. Hearing this enumeration, I thought, how is it that Comrade Bukharin has forgotten a small trifle, the Bashkirs? There are no Bushmen in Russia, nor have I heard that the Hottentots have laid claim to an autonomous republic, but we have Bashkirs, Kirghiz and a number of other peoples, and to these we cannot deny

recognition. We cannot deny it to a single one of the peoples living within the boundaries of the former Russian Empire. Let us even assume that the Bashkirs have overthrown the exploiters and we have helped them to do so. This is possible only when a revolution has fully matured, and it must be done cautiously, so as not to retard by one's interference that very process of the differentiation of the proletariat which we ought to expedite. What, then, can we do in relation to such peoples as the Kirghiz, the Uzbeks, the Tajiks, the Turkmen, who to this day are under the influence of their mullahs? Here, in Russia, the population, having had a long experience of the priests, helped us to overthrow them. But you know how badly the decree on civil marriage is still being put into effect. Can we approach these peoples and tell them that we shall overthrow their exploiters? We cannot do this, because they are entirely subordinated to their mullahs. In such cases we have to wait until the given nation develops, until the differentiation of the proletariat from the bourgeois elements, which is inevitable, has taken place.

Comrade Bukharin does not want to wait. He is possessed by impatience: "Why should we? When we have ourselves overthrown the bourgeoisie, proclaimed Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat, why should we act thus?" This has the effect of a rousing appeal, it contains an indication of our path, but if we were to proclaim only this in our programme, it would not be a programme, but a proclamation. We may proclaim Soviet power, and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and express the contempt for the bourgeoisie they deserve a thousand times over, but in the programme we must write just what actually exists with the greatest precision. And then our programme will be incontrovertible.

We hold a strictly class standpoint. What we are writing in the programme is a recognition of what has actually taken place since the time we wrote of the self-determination of nations in general. At that time there were still no proletarian republics. It was when they appeared, and only as they appeared, that we were able to write what is written here: "A federation of states organised after the *Soviet type*." The Soviet type is not yet Soviets as they exist in Russia.

but the Soviet type is becoming international. And this is all we can say. To go farther, one step farther, one hair's breadth farther, would be wrong, and therefore unsuitable for a programme.

We say that account must be taken of the stage reached by the given nation on its way from medievalism to bourgeois democracy, and from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy. That is absolutely correct. All nations have the right to self-determination—there is no need to speak specially of the Hottentots and the Bushmen. The vast majority, most likely nine-tenths of the population of the earth, perhaps 95 per cent, come under this description, since all countries are on the way from medievalism to bourgeois democracy or from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy. This is an absolutely inevitable course. More cannot be said, because it would be wrong, because it would not be what actually exists. To reject the self-determination of nations and insert the self-determination of the working people would be absolutely wrong, because this manner of settling the question does not reckon with the difficulties, with the zigzag course taken by differentiation within nations. In Germany it is not proceeding in the same way as in our country—in certain respects more rapidly, and in other respects in a slower and more sanguinary way. Not a single party in our country accepted so monstrous an idea as a combination of workers' councils and a Constituent Assembly. And yet we have to live side by side with these nations. Now Scheidemann's party is already saying that we want to conquer Germany. That is of course ridiculous, nonsensical. But the bourgeoisie have their own interests and their own press, which is shouting this to the whole world in hundreds of millions of copies; Wilson, too, is supporting this in his own interests. The Bolsheviks, they declare, have a large army, and they want, by means of conquest, to implant their Bolshevism in Germany. The best people in Germany—the Spartacists—told us that the German workers are being incited against the Communists; look, they are told, how bad things are with the Bolsheviks! And we cannot say that things with us are very good. And so our enemies in Germany influence the people with the argument that the proletarian revolution in Germany would result

in the same disorders as in Russia. Our disorders are a protracted illness. We are contending with desperate difficulties in creating the proletarian dictatorship in our country. As long as the bourgeoisie, or the petty bourgeoisie, or even part of the German workers, are under the influence of this bugbear—"the Bolsheviks want to establish their system by force"—so long will the formula "the self-determination of the working people" not help matters. We must arrange things so that the German traitor-socialists will not be able to say that the Bolsheviks are trying to impose their universal system, which, as it were, can be brought into Berlin on Red Army bayonets. And this is what may happen if the principle of the self-determination of nations is denied.

Our programme must not speak of the self-determination of the working people, because that would be wrong. It must speak of what actually exists. Since nations are at different stages on the road from medievalism to bourgeois democracy and from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy, this thesis of our programme is absolutely correct. With us there have been very many zigzags on this road. Every nation must obtain the right to self-determination, and that will make the self-determination of the working people easier. In Finland the process of separation of the proletariat from the bourgeoisie is remarkably clear, forceful and deep. At any rate, things will not proceed there as they do in our country. If we were to declare that we do not recognise any Finnish nation, but only the working people, that would be sheer nonsense. We cannot refuse to recognise what actually exists; it will itself compel us to recognise it. The demarcation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie is proceeding in different countries in their own specific ways. Here we must act with utmost caution. We must be particularly cautious with regard to the various nations, for there is nothing worse than lack of confidence on the part of a nation. Self-determination of the proletariat is proceeding among the Poles. Here are the latest figures on the composition of the Warsaw Soviet of Workers' Deputies.³⁸ Polish traitor-socialists—333, Communists—297. This shows that, according to our revolutionary calendar, October in that country is not very far off. It is somewhere about August or September 1917. But, firstly, no decree has yet been issued

stating that all countries must live according to the Bolshevik revolutionary calendar; and even if it were issued, it would not be observed. And, secondly, the situation at present is such that the majority of the Polish workers, who are more advanced than ours and more cultured, share the standpoint of social-defencism, social-patriotism. We must wait. We cannot speak here of the self-determination of the working people. We must carry on propaganda in behalf of this differentiation. This is what we are doing, but there is not the slightest shadow of doubt that we must recognise the self-determination of the Polish nation now. That is clear. The Polish proletarian movement is taking the same course as ours, towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, but not in the same way as in Russia. And there the workers are being intimidated by statements to the effect that the Muscovites, the Great Russians, who have always oppressed the Poles, want to carry their Great-Russian chauvinism into Poland in the guise of communism. Communism cannot be imposed by force. When I said to one of the best comrades among the Polish Communists, "You will do it in a different way", he replied, "No, we shall do the same thing, but better than you." To such an argument I had absolutely no objections. They must be given the opportunity of fulfilling a modest wish—to create a better Soviet power than ours. We cannot help reckoning with the fact that things there are proceeding in rather a peculiar way, and we cannot say: "Down with the right of nations to self-determination! We grant the right of self-determination only to the working people." This self-determination proceeds in a very complex and difficult way. It exists nowhere but in Russia, and, while foreseeing every stage of development in other countries, we must decree nothing from Moscow. That is why this proposal is unacceptable in principle.

I now pass to the other points which I am to deal with in accordance with the plan we have drawn up. I have given the first place to the question of *small proprietors and middle peasants*. In this respect, Clause 47 states:

"With regard to the middle peasants, the policy of the Russian Communist Party is to draw them into the work of socialist construction gradually and systematically. The Party sets itself the task of separating them from the kulaks, of winning them to the side of the

working class by carefully attending to their needs, by combating their backwardness with ideological weapons and under no circumstances with measures of suppression, and by striving in all cases where their vital interests are concerned to come to practical agreements with them, making concessions to them in determining the methods of carrying out socialist reforms."

It seems to me that here we are formulating what the founders of socialism have frequently said regarding the middle peasants. The only defect of this clause is that it is not sufficiently concrete. We could hardly give more in a programme. But it is not only questions of programme we must discuss at the Congress, and we must give profound, thrice-profound consideration to the question of the middle peasants. We have information to the effect that in the revolts which have occurred in some places, a *general plan* is clearly discernible, and that this plan is obviously connected with the military plan of the whiteguards, who have decided on a general offensive in March and on the organisation of a number of revolts. In the presidium of the Congress there is a draft of an appeal in the name of the Congress, which will be reported to you.³⁹ These revolts show as clear as can be that the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries and a part of the Mensheviks—in Bryansk it was the Mensheviks who worked to provoke the revolt—are acting as actual agents of the whiteguards. A general offensive of the whiteguards, revolts in the villages, the interruption of railway traffic—perhaps it will be possible to overthrow the Bolsheviki in this way? Here the role of the middle peasants stands out especially clearly, forcibly and insistently. At the Congress we must not only lay particular stress on our accommodating attitude towards the middle peasants, but also think over a number of measures, as concrete as possible, which will directly give at least something to the middle peasants. These measures are absolutely essential for self-preservation and for the struggle against all our enemies; they know that the middle peasant vacillates between us and them and they are endeavouring to win him away from us. Our position is now such that we possess vast reserves. We know that both the Polish and the Hungarian revolutions are growing, and very rapidly. These revolutions will furnish us with proletarian reserves, will ease our situation and will to a very large ex-

tent reinforce our proletarian base, which is weak. This may happen in the next few months, but we do not know just when. You know that an acute moment has now come and therefore the question of the middle peasants now assumes tremendous practical importance.

Further, I should like to dwell on the question of *co-operation*—that is Clause 48 of our programme. To a certain extent this clause has become obsolete. When we were drafting it in the commission, co-operatives existed in our country, but there were no consumers' communes; a few days later, however, the decree on the merging of all forms of co-operatives into a single consumers' commune was issued. I do not know whether this decree has been published and whether the majority of those here present are acquainted with it. If not, it will be published tomorrow or the day after. In this respect, this clause is already out of date, but it nevertheless appears to me that it is necessary, for we all know very well that it is a pretty long way from decrees to fulfilment. We have been toiling and moiling over the co-operatives since April 1918, and although we have achieved considerable success, it is not yet a decisive success. We have at times succeeded in organising the population in the co-operatives to such an extent that in many of the uyezds 98 per cent of the rural population are already so organised. But these co-operatives, which existed in capitalist society, are saturated with the spirit of bourgeois society, and are headed by Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, by bourgeois experts. We have not yet been able to establish our authority over them, and here our task remains unaccomplished. Our decree is a step forward in that it creates consumers' communes; it orders that all forms of co-operation all over Russia shall be merged. But this decree, too, even if we carry it into effect entirely, leaves the autonomous sections of workers' co-operatives within the future consumers' communes, because representatives of the workers' co-operatives who have a practical knowledge of the matter told us, and proved it, that the workers' co-operatives, as a more highly developed organisation, should be preserved, since their operations are essential. There were quite a few differences and disputes within our Party over the question of co-operation; there was friction between the Bolsheviks in

the co-operatives and the Bolsheviks in the Soviets. In principle, it seems to me that the question should undoubtedly be settled in the sense that this apparatus, the only one for which capitalism paved the way among the people, the only one operating among a rural population still at the level of primitive capitalism, must be preserved at all costs; it must be developed and must not, under any circumstances be discarded. The task here is a difficult one because in the majority of cases the leaders of the co-operatives are bourgeois specialists, very frequently real whiteguards. Hence the hatred for them, a legitimate hatred, hence the fight against them. But it must, of course, be conducted skilfully: *we must put a stop to the counter-revolutionary attempts of the co-operators, but this must not be a struggle against the apparatus of the co-operatives.* While getting rid of the counter-revolutionary leaders, we must establish our authority over the apparatus itself. Here our aim is exactly the same as it is in the case of the bourgeois experts, which is another question I should like to refer to.

The question of the *bourgeois experts* is provoking quite a lot of friction and divergences of opinion. When I recently had occasion to speak to the Petrograd Soviet, among the written questions submitted to me there were several devoted to the question of rates of pay. I was asked whether it is permissible in a socialist republic to pay as much as 3,000 rubles. We have, in fact, included this question in the programme, because dissatisfaction on these grounds has gone rather far. The question of the bourgeois experts has arisen in the army, in industry, in the co-operatives, everywhere. It is a very important question of the period of transition from capitalism to communism. We shall be able to build up communism only when, with the means provided by bourgeois science and technology, we make it more accessible to the people. There is no other way of building a communist society. But in order to build it in this way, we must take the apparatus from the bourgeoisie, we must enlist all these experts in the work. We have intentionally explained this question in detail in the programme in order to have it settled radically. We are perfectly aware of the effects of Russia's cultural underdevelopment, of what it is doing to Soviet power—which in principle has provided an immensely

higher proletarian democracy, which has created a model of such democracy for the whole world—how this lack of culture is reducing the significance of Soviet power and reviving bureaucracy. The Soviet apparatus is accessible to all the working people in word, but actually it is far from being accessible to all of them, as we all know. And not because the laws prevent it from being so, as was the case under the bourgeoisie; on the contrary, our laws assist in this respect. But in this matter laws alone are not enough. A vast amount of educational, organisational and cultural work is required; this cannot be done rapidly by legislation but demands a vast amount of work over a long period. This question of the bourgeois experts must be settled quite definitely at this Congress. The settlement of the question will enable the comrades, who are undoubtedly following this Congress attentively, to lean on its authority and to realise what difficulties we are up against. It will help those comrades who come up against this question at every step to take part at least in propaganda work.

The comrades here in Moscow who are representing the Spartacists at the Congress told us that in western Germany, where industry is most developed, and where the influence of the Spartacists among the workers is greatest, engineers and managers in very many of the large enterprises would come to the Spartacists, although the Spartacists have not yet been victorious there, and say, "We shall go with you." That was not the case in our country. Evidently, there the higher cultural level of the workers, the greater proletarianisation of the engineering personnel, and perhaps a number of other causes of which we do not know, have created relations which differ somewhat from ours.

At any rate, here we have one of the chief obstacles to further progress. We must immediately, without waiting for the support of other countries, immediately, at this very moment develop our productive forces. We cannot do this without the bourgeois experts. That must be said once and for all. Of course, the majority of these experts have a thoroughly bourgeois outlook. They must be placed in an environment of comradely collaboration, of worker commissars and of communist nuclei; they must be so placed that they cannot break out; but they must be given the opportu-

nity of working in better conditions than they did under capitalism, since this group of people, which has been trained by the bourgeoisie, will not work otherwise. To compel a whole section of the population to work under coercion is impossible—that we know very well from experience. We can compel them not to take an active part in counter-revolution, we can intimidate them so as to make them dread to respond to the appeals of the whiteguards. In this respect the Bolsheviks act energetically. This can be done, and this we are doing adequately. This we have all learned to do. But it is impossible in this way to compel a whole section to work. These people are accustomed to do cultural work, they advanced it within the framework of the bourgeois system, that is, they enriched the bourgeoisie with tremendous material acquisitions, but gave them to the proletariat in infinitesimal doses—nevertheless they did advance culture, that was their job. As they see the working class promoting organised and advanced sections, which not only value culture but also help to convey it to the people, they are changing their attitude towards us. When a doctor sees that the proletariat is arousing the working people to independent activity in fighting epidemics, his attitude towards us completely changes. We have a large section of such bourgeois doctors, engineers, agronomists and co-operators, and when they see in practice that the proletariat is enlisting more and more people to this cause, they will be conquered *morally*, and not merely be cut off from the bourgeoisie politically. Our task will then become easier. They will then of themselves be drawn into our apparatus and become part of it. To achieve this, sacrifices are necessary. To pay even two thousand million for this is a trifle. To fear this sacrifice would be childish, for it would mean that we do not comprehend the tasks before us.

The chaos in our transport, the chaos in industry and agriculture are undermining the very life of the Soviet Republic. Here we must resort to the most energetic measures, straining every nerve of the country to the utmost. We must not practise a policy of petty pinpricks with regard to the experts. These experts are not the servitors of the exploiters, they are active cultural workers, who in bourgeois society served the bourgeoisie, and of whom all socialists all over

the world said that in a proletarian society they would serve *us*. In this transition period we must accord them the best possible conditions of life. That will be the best policy. That will be the most economical management. Otherwise, while saving a few hundred millions, we may lose so much that no sum will be sufficient to restore what we have lost.

When we discussed the question of rates of pay with the Commissar for Labour, Schmidt, he mentioned facts like these. He said that in the matter of equalising wages we have done more than any bourgeois state has done anywhere, or can do in scores of years. Take the pre-war rates of pay: a manual labourer used to get one ruble a day, twenty-five rubles a month, while an expert got five hundred rubles a month, not counting those who were paid hundreds of thousands of rubles. The expert used to receive twenty times more than the worker. Our present rates of pay vary from six hundred rubles to three thousand rubles—only five times more. We have done a great deal towards equalising the rates. Of course, we are now overpaying experts, but to pay them a little more for giving us their knowledge is not only worth while, but necessary and theoretically indispensable. In my opinion, this question is dealt with in sufficient detail in the programme. It must be particularly stressed. Not only must it be settled here in principle, but we must see to it that every delegate to the Congress, on returning to his locality, should, in his report to his organisation and in all his activities, secure its execution.

We have already succeeded in bringing about a thorough change of attitude among the vacillating intellectuals. Yesterday we were talking about legalising the petty-bourgeois parties, but today we are arresting the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries; by this switching back and forth we are applying a very definite system. A consistent and very firm line runs through these changes of policy, namely, *to cut off counter-revolution and to utilise the cultural apparatus of the bourgeoisie*. The Mensheviks are the worst enemies of socialism, because they clothe themselves in a proletarian disguise; but the Mensheviks are a non-proletarian group. In this group there is only an insignificant proletarian upper layer, while the group itself consists of petty intellectuals. This group is coming over to our side. We shall

take it over wholly, as a group. Every time they come to us, we say, "Welcome!" With every one of these vacillations, part of them come over to us. This was the case with the Mensheviks and the *Novaya Zhizn* people and with the Socialist-Revolutionaries; this will be the case with all these vacillators, who will long continue to get in our way, whine and desert one camp for the other—you cannot do anything with them. But through all these vacillations we shall be enlisting groups of cultured intellectuals into the ranks of Soviet workers, and we shall cut off those elements that continue to support the whiteguards.

The next question which, according to the division of subjects, falls to my share is the *question of bureaucracy and of enlisting the broad mass of the people in Soviet work*. We have been hearing complaints about bureaucracy for a long time; the complaints are undoubtedly well founded. We have done what no other state in the world has done in the fight against bureaucracy. The apparatus which was a thoroughly bureaucratic and bourgeois apparatus of oppression, and which remains such even in the freest of bourgeois republics, we have destroyed to its very foundations. Take, for example, the courts. Here, it is true, the task was easier; we did not have to create a new apparatus, because anybody can act as a judge basing himself on the revolutionary sense of justice of the working classes. We have still by no means completed the work in this field but in a number of respects we have made the courts what they should be. We have created bodies on which not only men, but also women, the most backward and conservative section of the population, can be made to serve without exception.

The employees in the other spheres of government are more hardened bureaucrats. The task here is more difficult. We cannot live without this apparatus; every branch of government creates a demand for such an apparatus. Here we are suffering from the fact that Russia was not sufficiently developed as a capitalist country. Germany, apparently, will suffer less from this, because her bureaucratic apparatus passed through an extensive school, which sucks people dry but compels them to work and not just wear out armchairs, as happens in our offices. We dispersed these old bureaucrats, shuffled them and then began to place them in new posts.

The tsarist bureaucrats began to join the Soviet institutions and practise their bureaucratic methods, they began to assume the colouring of Communists and, to succeed better in their careers, to procure membership cards of the Russian Communist Party. And so, they have been thrown out of the door but they creep back in through the window. What makes itself felt here most is the lack of cultured forces. These bureaucrats may be dismissed, but they cannot be re-educated all at once. Here we are confronted chiefly with organisational, cultural and educational problems.

We can fight bureaucracy to the bitter end, to a complete victory, only when the whole population participates in the work of government. In the bourgeois republics not only is this impossible, *but the law itself prevents it*. The best of the bourgeois republics, no matter how democratic they may be, have thousands of legal hindrances which prevent the working people from participating in the work of government. What we have done, was to remove these hindrances, but so far we have not reached the stage at which the working people could participate in government. Apart from the law, there is still the level of culture, which you cannot subject to any law. The result of this low cultural level is that the Soviets, which by virtue of their programme are organs of government *by the working people*, are in fact organs of government *for the working people* by the advanced section of the proletariat, but not by the working people as a whole.

Here we are confronted by a problem which cannot be solved except by prolonged education. At present this task is an inordinately difficult one for us, because, as I have had frequent occasion to say, the section of workers who are governing is inordinately, incredibly *small*. We must secure help. According to all indications, such a reserve is growing up within the country. There cannot be the slightest doubt of the existence of a tremendous thirst for knowledge and of tremendous progress in education—mostly attained outside the schools—of tremendous progress in educating the working people. This progress cannot be confined within any school framework, but it is tremendous. All indications go to show that we shall obtain a vast reserve in the near future, which will replace the representatives of the small section of proletarians who have overstrained themselves

in the work. But, in any case, our present situation in this respect is extremely difficult. Bureaucracy has been defeated. The exploiters have been eliminated. But the cultural level has not been raised, and therefore the bureaucrats are occupying their old positions. They can be forced to retreat only if the proletariat and the peasants are organised far more extensively than has been the case up to now, and only if real measures are taken to enlist the workers in government. You are all aware of such measures in the case of every People's Commissariat, and I shall not dwell on them.

The last point I have to deal with is the question of *the leading role of the proletariat and disfranchisement*. Our Constitution recognises the precedence of the proletariat in respect of the peasants and disfranchises the exploiters. It was this that the pure democrats of Western Europe attacked most. We answered, and are answering, that they have forgotten the most fundamental propositions of Marxism, they have forgotten that with them it is a case of bourgeois democracy, whereas we have passed to *proletarian* democracy. There is not a single country in the world which has done even one-tenth of what the Soviet Republic has done in the past few months for the workers and the poor peasants in enlisting them in the work of administering the state. That is an absolute truth. Nobody will deny that in the matter of true, not paper, democracy, in the matter of enlisting the workers and peasants, we have done more than has been done or could be done by the best of the democratic republics in hundreds of years. It was this that determined the significance of the Soviets, it was owing to this that the Soviets have become a slogan for the proletariat of all countries.

But this in no way saves us from stumbling over the inadequate culture of the people. We do not at all regard the question of disfranchising the bourgeoisie from an absolute point of view, because it is theoretically quite conceivable that the dictatorship of the proletariat may suppress the bourgeoisie at every step without disfranchising them. This is theoretically quite conceivable. Nor do we propose our Constitution as a model for other countries. All we say is that whoever conceives the transition to socialism without the suppression of the bourgeoisie is not a socialist. But

while it is essential to suppress the bourgeoisie as a class, it is not essential to deprive them of suffrage and of equality. We do not want freedom for the bourgeoisie, we do not recognise equality of exploiters and exploited, but this question is so handled in the programme that the Constitution does not prescribe such measures as the inequality of workers and peasants. They were embodied in the Constitution *after* they were already in actual practice. It was not even the Bolsheviks who drew up the Constitution of the Soviets; it was drawn up to their own detriment by the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries before the Bolshevik revolution. They drew it up in accordance with the conditions actually obtaining. The organisation of the proletariat proceeded much more rapidly than the organisation of the peasants, which fact made the workers the bulwark of the revolution and gave them a virtual advantage. The next task is gradually to pass from these advantages to their equalisation. Nobody drove the bourgeoisie out of the Soviets either before or after the October Revolution. *The bourgeoisie themselves left the Soviets.*

That is how the matter stands with the question of suffrage for the bourgeoisie. It is our task to put the question with absolute clarity. We do not in the least apologise for our behaviour, but give an absolutely precise enumeration of the facts as they are. As we point out, our Constitution was obliged to introduce this inequality because the cultural level is low and because with us organisation is weak. But we do not make this an ideal; on the contrary, in its programme the Party undertakes to work systematically to abolish this inequality between the better organised proletariat and the peasants. We shall abolish this inequality as soon as we succeed in raising the cultural level. We shall then be able to get along without such restrictions. Even now, after some seventeen months of revolution, these restrictions are of very small practical importance.

These, comrades, are the main points on which I believed it necessary to dwell in the general discussion of the programme, in order to leave their further consideration to the debate. (*Applause.*)

4

SPEECH CLOSING THE DEBATE
ON THE PARTY PROGRAMME
MARCH 19

(*Applause.*) Comrades, I could not divide this part of the question with Comrade Bukharin, after preliminary consultation, in such detail as was the case with the report. Perhaps it will prove unnecessary. I think the debate that unfolded here revealed primarily one thing—the absence of any definite and formulated counter-proposal. Many speakers dealt with separate points in a desultory way, but made no counter-proposals. I shall deal with the chief objections, which were mainly directed against the preamble. Comrade Bukharin told me that he is one of those who believe that it is possible in the preamble to combine a description of capitalism with a description of imperialism in such a way as to form an integral whole, but since this has not been done, we shall have to accept the existing draft.

Many of the speakers argued—and it was particularly emphasised by Comrade Podbelsky—that the draft presented to you is wrong. The arguments Comrade Podbelsky advanced were very strange indeed. For instance, he said that in Clause 1 the revolution is referred to as the revolution of such-and-such a date, and for some reason this suggested to Comrade Podbelsky the idea that even this revolution is numbered. I may say that in the Council of People's Commissars we have to deal with numerous documents with index numbers, and often we get a little tired of them. But why convey this impression here? What has an index number to do with the question? We fix the day of the holiday and celebrate it. Can it be denied that it was precisely on October 25 that we

captured power? If you were to attempt to change this in any way, it would be artificial. If you call the revolution the October-November Revolution, you provide a pretext for saying that it was not accomplished in one day. Of course, it was accomplished in a longer period—not in October, not in November, and not even in one year. Comrade Podbelsky took exception to the fact that one of the clauses speaks of the *impending* social revolution. On these grounds he made it appear that the programme was guilty of the crime of "offending Her Majesty the social revolution". Here we are in the middle of the social revolution and yet the programme says that it is impending! This argument is obviously groundless, because the revolution referred to in our programme is the world social revolution.

We are told that we approach the revolution from the economic point of view. Should we do so or not? Many over-enthusiastic comrades here went as far as to talk about a world Economic Council, and about subordinating all the national parties to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party. Comrade Pyatakov almost went as far as to say the same. (*Pyatakov, from his place:* "Do you think that would be a bad thing?") Since he now says that it would not be a bad thing, I must reply that if there were anything like this in the programme, there would be no need to criticise it: the authors of such a proposal would have dug their own graves. These over-enthusiastic comrades have overlooked the fact that in the programme we must take our stand on what actually exists. One of these comrades—I think it was Sunitsa, who criticised the programme very vigorously and said it was worthless, and so forth—one of these over-enthusiastic comrades said that he did not agree that it must contain what actually exists, and proposed that it should contain what does not exist. (*Laughter.*) I think that this argument is so obviously false that the laughter it evokes is quite natural. I did not say that it must contain only what actually exists. I said that we must *proceed from what has been definitely established*. We must say and prove to the proletarians and working peasants that the communist revolution is inevitable. Did anybody here suggest that it is not necessary to say this? Had anybody made such a suggestion, it would have been proved to him that he was wrong. Nobody made any

such suggestion, nor will anybody do so, because it is an undoubted fact that our Party came to power with the aid not only of the communist proletariat, but also of all the peasants. Shall we confine ourselves to telling these people who are now marching with us: "The Party's only function is to carry on socialist construction. The communist revolution has been accomplished, put communism into effect." Such an opinion would be utterly groundless, it would be wrong from the theoretical point of view. Our Party has absorbed directly, and still more indirectly, millions of people who are now beginning to understand the class struggle, to understand the transition from capitalism to communism.

It may now be said, and it would be no exaggeration at all to do so, of course, that nowhere, in no other country, have the working people displayed such keen interest in the question of transforming capitalism into socialism as the working people in our country today. Our people are giving more thought to this than the people of any other country. Is the Party not to give a reply to this question? We must demonstrate scientifically how this communist revolution will progress. All the other proposals fall short in this respect. Nobody wanted to delete it entirely. There was some vague talk about it being possible to abbreviate it, about not quoting from the old programme because it is wrong. But if the old programme were wrong, how could it have served as the basis of our activities for so many years? Perhaps we shall have a common programme when the world Soviet Republic is set up; by that time we shall probably have drafted several more programmes. But it would be premature to draft one now, when only one Soviet Republic exists in what was formerly the Russian Empire. Even Finland, which is undoubtedly advancing towards a Soviet Republic, has not yet reached it. And yet the Finnish people are the most cultured of the peoples that inhabit what was formerly the Russian Empire. Consequently, it is utterly wrong to demand that the programme should now reflect a finished process. It would be on a par with inserting the demand for a world Economic Council. We ourselves have not yet grown accustomed to this ugly word *Sovnarkhoz*—Economic Council; as for foreigners, it is said that some of them searched the railway directory, thinking that there was

a station of that name. (*Laughter.*) We cannot dictate such words to the whole world by means of decrees.

To be international, our programme must take into account the class factors which are characteristic of the economy of all countries. It is characteristic of all countries that capitalism is still developing in a great many places. This is true of the whole of Asia, of all countries which are advancing towards bourgeois democracy; it is true of a number of parts of Russia. For instance, Comrade Rykov, who is closely familiar with the facts in the economic field, told us of the new bourgeoisie which have arisen in our country. This is true. The bourgeoisie are emerging not only from among our Soviet government employees—only a very few can emerge from their ranks—but from the ranks of the peasants and handicraftsmen who have been liberated from the yoke of the capitalist banks, and who are now cut off from railway communication. This is a fact. How do you think you will get round this fact? You are only fostering your own illusions, or introducing badly digested book-learning into reality, which is far more complex. It shows that even in Russia, capitalist commodity production is alive, operating, developing and giving rise to a bourgeoisie, in the same way as it does in every capitalist society.

Comrade Rykov said, "We are fighting against the bourgeoisie who are springing up in our country because the peasant economy has not yet disappeared; this economy gives rise to a bourgeoisie and to capitalism." We do not have exact figures about it, but it is beyond doubt that this is the case. So far a Soviet Republic exists only within the boundaries of what was formerly the Russian Empire. It is maturing and developing in a number of countries, but it does not yet exist in any other country. It would, therefore, be fantastic to claim in our programme something we have not yet reached; it would merely express a desire to escape unpleasant reality, which shows that the birth-pangs of other countries bringing forth socialist republics are undoubtedly more severe than those we experienced. We found it easy because on October 27, 1917, we gave legal effect to what the peasants had demanded in the resolutions of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party. This is not the case in any other country. A Swiss comrade and a German comrade told us that in Switzerland the

peasants took up arms against the strikers as never before, and that in Germany there is not the faintest indications in the rural districts of the likelihood of the appearance of councils of agricultural labourers and small peasants. In our country, however, Soviets of Peasants' Deputies were formed almost over the entire country in the first few months of the revolution. We, a backward country, created them. Here a gigantic problem arises, for which the people in the capitalist countries have not yet found a solution. Were we a model capitalist nation? Survivals of serfdom were still to be found in this country right up to 1917. But no nation organised on capitalist lines has yet shown how this problem can be solved in practice. We achieved power under exceptional conditions, when tsarist despotism stimulated a great burst of effort to bring about a radical and rapid change; and under these exceptional conditions we were able for several months to rely on the support of all the peasants. This is a historical fact. Right up to the summer of 1918, up to the time of the formation of the Poor Peasants' Committees, we were holding on as a government because we enjoyed the support of all the peasants. This is impossible in any capitalist country. And it is this fundamental economic fact that you forget when you talk about radically redrafting the whole programme. Without this your programme will have no scientific foundation.

We must take as our point of departure the universally recognised Marxist thesis that a programme must be built on a scientific foundation. It must explain to the people how the communist revolution arose, why it is inevitable, what its significance, nature, and power are, and what problems it must solve. Our programme must be a summary for agitational purposes, a summary such as all programmes were, such as, for instance, the Erfurt Programme⁴⁰ was. Every clause of that programme contained material for agitators to use in hundreds of thousands of speeches and articles. Every clause of our programme is something that every working man and woman must know, assimilate and understand. If they do not know what capitalism is, if they do not understand that small peasant and handicraft economy constantly, inevitably and necessarily engenders this capitalism—if they do not understand this, then even if they were to

declare themselves Communists a hundred times and flaunt the most radical communism, it would not be worth a brass farthing, because we value communism only when it is based on economic facts.

The socialist revolution will cause many changes even in some of the advanced countries. The capitalist mode of production still exists in all parts of the world, and in many places it still bears its less developed forms in spite of the fact that imperialism has mobilised and concentrated finance capital. There is not a country in the world, even the most developed, where capitalism is to be found exclusively in its most perfect form. There is nothing like it even in Germany. When we were collecting material for our particular assignments, the comrade in charge of the Central Statistical Board informed us that in Germany the peasants *concealed* from the Food Supply Departments 40 per cent of their surplus potatoes. Small peasant farms, which engage in free, petty trading, and petty profiteering, are still to be found in a capitalist country where capitalism has reached its full development. Such facts must not be forgotten. Of the 300,000 members of the Party who are represented here, are there many who fully understand this question? It would be ridiculous conceit to imagine that because we, whose good fortune it was to draft this programme, understand all this, the entire mass of Communists also understands it. They do not, and they need this ABC. They need it a hundred times more than we do, because people who have not grasped, who have not understood what communism is and what commodity production is, are far removed from communism. We come across these cases of small commodity economy every day, in every question of practical economic policy, food policy, agricultural policy, on matters concerning the Supreme Economic Council. And yet we are told that we ought not to speak about it in the programme! If we heeded this advice we would only show that we are incapable of solving this problem, and that the success of the revolution in our country is due to exceptional circumstances.

Comrades from Germany visit us to study the forms of the socialist system. And we must act in such a way as to prove to our comrades from abroad that we are strong, to enable them to see that in our revolution we are not in the

least exceeding the bounds of reality, and to provide them with material that will be absolutely irrefutable. It would be absurd to set up our revolution as the ideal for all countries, to imagine that it has made a number of brilliant discoveries and has introduced a heap of socialist innovations. I have not heard anybody make this claim and I assert that we shall not hear anybody make it. We have acquired practical experience in taking the first steps towards destroying capitalism in a country where specific relations exist between the proletariat and the peasants. Nothing more. If we behave like the frog in the fable and become puffed up with conceit, we shall only make ourselves the laughing-stock of the world, we shall be mere braggarts.

We educated the party of the proletariat with the aid of the Marxist programme, and the tens of millions of working people in our country must be educated in the same way. We have assembled here as ideological leaders and we must say to the people: "We educated the proletariat, and in doing so we always took our stand first and foremost on an exact economic analysis." This cannot be done by means of a manifesto. The manifesto of the Third International is an appeal, a proclamation, it calls attention to the tasks that confront us, it is an appeal to the people's sentiments. Take the trouble to prove scientifically that you have an economic basis, and that you are not building on sand. If you cannot do that, do not undertake to draw up a programme. To do it, we must necessarily review what we have lived through in these fifteen years. Fifteen years ago we said that we were advancing towards the social revolution, and now we have arrived; does that fact weaken our position? On the contrary, it reinforces and strengthens it. It all amounts to this, that capitalism is developing into imperialism, and imperialism leads to the beginning of the socialist revolution. It is tedious and lengthy, and not a single capitalist country has yet gone through this process, but it is necessary to deal with this in the programme.

That is why the theoretical arguments that have been levelled against this hold no water. I have no doubt that if we were to set ten or twenty writers, who are well able to expound their ideas, to work for three or four hours a day, they would, in the course of a month, draw up a better

and more integral programme. But to demand that this should be done in a day or two, as Comrade Podbelsky does, is ridiculous. We worked for more than a day or two, or even a couple of weeks. I repeat that if it were possible to select a commission of thirty persons and set them to work several hours a day for a month, and moreover, not allow them to be disturbed by telephone calls, there can be no doubt that they would produce a programme five times better than this one. But nobody here has disputed essentials. A programme which says nothing about the fundamentals of commodity economy and capitalism will not be a Marxist international programme. To be international it is not enough for it to proclaim a world Soviet republic, or the abolition of nations, as Comrade Pyatakov did when he said: "We don't want any nations. What we want is the union of all proletarians." This is splendid, of course, and eventually it will come about, but at an entirely different stage of communist development. Comrade Pyatakov said in a patronising tone: "You were backward in 1917, but you have made progress." We made progress when we put into the programme something that began to conform to reality. When we said that nations advance from bourgeois democracy to proletarian government, we stated what was a fact, although in 1917 it was merely an expression of what you desired.

When we establish with the Spartacists that complete comradesly confidence needed for united communism, the comradesly confidence that is maturing day by day, and which, perhaps, will come into being in a few months' time, we shall record it in the programme. But to proclaim it when it does not yet exist, would mean dragging them into something for which their own experience has not yet prepared them. We say that the Soviet type has acquired international significance. Comrade Bukharin mentioned the Shop Stewards' Committees in Britain. These are not quite Soviets. They are developing but they are still in the embryonic stage. When they burst into full bloom, we shall "see what happens". But the argument that we are presenting Russian Soviets to the British workers is beyond all criticism.

I must now deal with the question of self-determination of nations. Our criticism has served to exaggerate the importance of this question. The defect in our criticism was

that it attached special significance to this question, which, in substance, is of less than secondary importance in the programme's general structure, in the sum total of programme demands.

While Comrade Pyatakov was speaking I was amazed and asked myself what it was, a debate on the programme, or a dispute between two Organising Bureaus? When Comrade Pyatakov said that the Ukrainian Communists act in conformity with the instructions of the Central Committee of the R.C.P.(B.), I was not sure about the tone in which he said it. Was it regret? I do not suspect Comrade Pyatakov of that, but what he said was tantamount to asking what was the good of all this self-determination when we have a splendid Central Committee in Moscow. This is a childish point of view. The Ukraine was separated from Russia by exceptional circumstances, and the national movement did not take deep root there. Whatever there was of such a movement the Germans killed. This is a fact, but an exceptional fact. Even as regards the language it is not clear whether the Ukrainian language today is the language of the common people or not. The mass of working people of the other nations greatly distrusted the Great Russians whom they regarded as a kulak and oppressor nation. That is a fact. A Finnish representative told me that among the Finnish bourgeoisie, who hated the Great Russians, voices are to be heard saying: "The Germans proved to be more savage brutes, the Entente proved to be more savage, we had better have the Bolsheviks." This is the tremendous victory we have gained over the Finnish bourgeoisie in the national question. This does not in the least prevent us from fighting it as our class enemy and from choosing the proper methods for the purpose. The Soviet Republic, which has been established in the country where tsarism formerly oppressed Finland, must declare that it respects the right of nations to independence. We concluded a treaty with the short-lived Red Finnish Government and agreed to certain territorial concessions, to which I heard quite a number of utterly chauvinistic objections, such as: "There are excellent fisheries there, and you have surrendered them." These are the kind of objections which induce me to say, "Scratch some Communists and you will find Great-Russian chauvinists."

I think that the case of Finland, as well as of the Bashkirs, shows that in dealing with the national question one cannot argue that economic unity should be effected under all circumstances. Of course, it is necessary! But we must endeavour to secure it by propaganda, by agitation, by a voluntary alliance. The Bashkirs distrust the Great Russians because the Great Russians are more cultured and have utilised their culture to rob the Bashkirs. That is why the term Great Russian is synonymous with the terms "oppressor", "rogue" to Bashkirs in those remote places. This must be taken into account, it must be combated, but it will be a lengthy process. It cannot be eliminated by a decree. We must be very cautious in this matter. Exceptional caution must be displayed by a nation like the Great Russians, who earned the bitter hatred of all the other nations; we have only just learned how to remedy the situation, and then, not entirely. For instance, at the Commissariat of Education, or connected with it, there are Communists, who say that our schools are uniform schools, and therefore don't dare to teach in any language but Russian! In my opinion, such a Communist is a Great-Russian chauvinist. Many of us harbour such sentiments and they must be combated.

That is why we must tell the other nations that we are out-and-out internationalists and are striving for the voluntary alliance of the workers and peasants of all nations. This does not preclude wars in the least. War is another question, and arises out of the very nature of imperialism. If we are fighting Wilson, and Wilson uses a small nation as his tool, we say that we shall oppose that tool. We have never said anything different. We have never said that a socialist republic can exist without military forces. War may be necessary under certain circumstances. But at present, the essence of the question of the self-determination of nations is that different nations are advancing in the same historical direction, but by very different zigzags and by-paths, and that the more cultured nations are obviously proceeding in a way that differs from that of the less cultured nations. Finland advanced in a different way. Germany is advancing in a different way. Comrade Pyatakov is a thousand times right when he says that we need unity. But we must strive for it by means of propaganda, by Party influence,

by forming united trade unions. But here, too, we must not act in a stereotyped way. If we do away with this point, or formulate it differently, we shall be deleting the national question from the programme. This might be done if there were people with no specific national features. But there are no such people, and we cannot build socialist society in any other way.

I think, comrades, that the programme proposed here should be accepted as a basis and then referred back to the commission, which should be enlarged by the inclusion of representatives of the opposition, or rather, of comrades who have made practical proposals, and that the commission should put forward (1) the amendments to the draft that have been enumerated, and (2) the theoretical objections on which no agreement can be reached. I think this will be the most practical way of dealing with the matter, and one that will most speedily lead to a correct decision. (*Applause.*)

5

WIRELESS MESSAGE OF GREETING
ON BEHALF OF THE CONGRESS TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF THE HUNGARIAN SOVIET REPUBLIC ⁴¹
MARCH 22

To the Government of the Hungarian Soviet Republic,
Budapest

The Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party sends ardent greetings to the Hungarian Soviet Republic. Our Congress is convinced that the time is not far distant when communism will triumph all over the world. The working class of Russia is making every effort to come to your aid. The proletariat throughout the world is watching your struggle with intense interest and will not permit the imperialists to raise their hands against the new Soviet Republic.

Long live the world communist republic!

First published in Hungarian
in the newspaper *Népszava* No. 71,
March 25, 1919

Published according to
the Russian translation

6

REPORT ON WORK IN THE COUNTRYSIDE
MARCH 23

(*Prolonged applause.*) Comrades, I must apologise for having been unable to attend all the meetings of the committee elected by the Congress to consider the question of work in the countryside.⁴² My report will therefore be supplemented by the speeches of comrades who have taken part in the work of the committee from the very beginning. The committee finally drew up theses which were turned over to a commission and which will be reported on to you. I should like to dwell on the general significance of the question as it confronts us following the work of the committee and as, in my opinion, it now confronts the whole Party.

Comrades, it is quite natural that as the proletarian revolution develops we have to put in the forefront first one then another of the most complex and important problems of social life. It is perfectly natural that in a revolution which affects, and is bound to affect, the deepest foundations of life and the broadest mass of the population, not a single party, not a single government, no matter how close it may be to the 'people, can possibly embrace all aspects of life *at once*. And if we now have to deal with the question of work in the countryside, and in connection with this question to give prominence to the position of the middle peasants, there is nothing strange or abnormal in this from the standpoint of the development of the proletarian revolution in general. It is natural that the proletarian revolution had to begin with the fundamental relation between two hostile classes, the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The principal task was to transfer power to the working class, to secure its

dictatorship, to overthrow the bourgeoisie and to deprive them of the economic sources of their power which would undoubtedly be a hindrance to all socialist construction in general. Since we are acquainted with Marxism, none of us have ever for a moment doubted the truth of the thesis that the very economic structure of capitalist society is such that the deciding factor in that society must be either the proletariat or the bourgeoisie. We now see many former Marxists—from the Menshevik camp, for example—who assert that in a period of decisive struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie *democracy in general* can prevail. This is what is said by the Mensheviks, who have come to a complete agreement with the Socialist-Revolutionaries. As though it were not the bourgeoisie themselves who create or abolish democracy as they find most convenient for themselves! And since that is so, there can be no question of democracy in general at a time of acute struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. It is astonishing how rapidly these Marxists or pseudo-Marxists—our Mensheviks, for example—expose themselves, and how rapidly their true nature, the nature of petty-bourgeois democrats, comes to the surface.

All his life Marx fought most of all the illusions of petty-bourgeois democracy and bourgeois democracy. Marx scoffed most of all at empty talk of freedom and equality, when it serves as a screen for the freedom of the workers to starve to death, or the equality between the one who sells his labour-power and the bourgeois who allegedly freely purchases that labour in the open market as if from an equal, and so forth. Marx explains this in all his economic works. It may be said that the whole of Marx's *Capital* is devoted to explaining the truth that *the basic forces of capitalist society are, and must be, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat*—bourgeoisie, as the builder of this capitalist society, as its leader, as its motive force, and the proletariat, as its gravedigger and as the only force capable of replacing it. You can hardly find a single chapter in any of Marx's works that is not devoted to this. You might say that all over the world the socialists of the Second International have vowed and sworn to the workers time and again that they understand this truth. But when matters reached the stage of the real and, moreover, decisive struggle for power between the pro-

letariat and the bourgeoisie we find that our Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, as well as the leaders of the old socialist parties all over the world, forgot this truth and began to repeat in purely parrot fashion the philistine phrases about democracy in general.

Attempts are sometimes made to lend these words what is considered to be greater force by speaking of the "dictatorship of democracy". That is sheer nonsense. We know perfectly well from history that the dictatorship of the democratic bourgeoisie meant nothing but the suppression of the insurgent workers. That has been the case ever since 1848—at any rate, beginning no later, and isolated examples may be found even earlier. History shows that it is precisely in a bourgeois democracy that a most acute struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie develops extensively and freely. We have had occasion to convince ourselves of this truth in practice. And the measures taken by the Soviet Government since October 1917 have been distinguished by their firmness on all fundamental questions precisely because we have never departed from this truth and have never forgotten it. The issue of the struggle for supremacy waged against the bourgeoisie can be settled only by the dictatorship of one class—the proletariat. Only the dictatorship of the proletariat can defeat the bourgeoisie. Only the proletariat can overthrow the bourgeoisie. And only the proletariat can secure the following of the people in the struggle against the bourgeoisie.

However, it by no means follows from this—and it would be a profound mistake to think it does—that in further building communism, when the bourgeoisie have been overthrown and political power is already in the hands of the proletariat, we can continue to carry on without the participation of the middle, intermediary elements.

It is natural that at the beginning of the revolution—the proletarian revolution—the whole attention of its active participants should be concentrated on the main and fundamental issue, the supremacy of the proletariat and the securing of that supremacy by a victory over the bourgeoisie—making it certain that the bourgeoisie cannot regain power. We are well aware that the bourgeoisie still enjoy the advantages derived from the wealth they possess in other countries or the monetary wealth they possess, sometimes

even in our own country. We are well aware that there are social elements who are more experienced than proletarians and who aid the bourgeoisie. We are well aware that the bourgeoisie have not abandoned the idea of returning to power and have not ceased attempting to restore their supremacy.

But that is by no means all. The bourgeoisie, who put forward most insistently the principle "my country is wherever it is good for me", and who, as far as money is concerned, have always been international—*the bourgeoisie internationally are still stronger than we are*. Their supremacy is being rapidly undermined, they are being confronted with such facts as the Hungarian revolution—about which we were happy to inform you yesterday and are today receiving confirming reports—and they are beginning to understand that their supremacy is shaky. They no longer enjoy freedom of action. But now, if you take into account the material means on the world scale, we cannot help admitting that in the material respect the bourgeoisie are at present still stronger than we are.

That is why nine-tenths of our attention and our practical activities were devoted, and had to be devoted, to this fundamental question—the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the establishment of the power of the proletariat and the elimination of every possibility of the return of the bourgeoisie to power. That is perfectly natural, legitimate, and unavoidable, and in this field very much has been accomplished.

Now, however, we must decide the question of other sections of the population. We must—and this was our unanimous conclusion in the agrarian committee, and on this, we are convinced, all Party workers will agree, because we merely summed up the results of their observations—we must now decide *the question of the middle peasants* in its totality.

Of course, there are people who, instead of studying the course taken by our revolution, instead of giving thought to the tasks now confronting us, instead of all this, make every step of the Soviet government a butt for the derision and criticism of the type we hear from those gentlemen, the Mensheviks and the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries. These people have still not understood that they must make a choice between us and the bourgeois dictatorship. We have

displayed great patience, even indulgence, towards these people. We shall allow them to enjoy our indulgence once more. But in the very near future we shall set a limit to our patience and indulgence, and if they do not make their choice, we shall tell them in all seriousness to go to Kolchak. (*Applause.*) We do not expect particularly brilliant intellectual ability from such people. (*Laughter.*) But it might have been expected that after experiencing the bestialities of Kolchak they ought to understand that we are entitled to demand that they should choose between us and Kolchak. If during the first few months that followed the October Revolution there were many naïve people who were stupid enough to believe that the dictatorship of the proletariat was something transient and fortuitous, today even the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries ought to understand that there is something logically necessary in the struggle that is being waged because of the onslaught of the whole international bourgeoisie.

Actually only two forces have been created—the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Whoever has not learned this from Marx, whoever has not learned this from the works of all the great socialists, has never been a socialist, has never understood anything about socialism, and has only called himself a socialist. We are allowing these people a brief period for reflection and demand that they make their decision. I have mentioned them because they are now saying or will say: “The Bolsheviks have raised the question of the middle peasants; they want to make advances to them.” I am very well aware that considerable space is given in the Menshevik press to arguments of this kind, and even far worse. We ignore such arguments; we never attach importance to the jabber of our adversaries. People who are still capable of running to and fro between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat may say what they please. We are following our own road.

Our road is determined above all by considerations of class forces. A struggle is developing in capitalist society between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. As long as that struggle has not ended we shall give our keenest attention to fighting it out to the end. It has not yet been brought to the end, although in that struggle much has already been

accomplished. The hands of the international bourgeoisie are no longer free; the best proof of this is that the Hungarian proletarian revolution has taken place. It is therefore clear that our rural organisational work has already gone beyond the limits to which it was confined when everything was subordinated to the fundamental demand of the struggle for power.

This development passed through two main phases. In October 1917 we seized power *together with the peasants as a whole*. This was a bourgeois revolution, inasmuch as the class struggle in the rural districts had not yet developed. As I have said, the real proletarian revolution in the rural districts began only in the summer of 1918. Had we not succeeded in stirring up this revolution our work would have been incomplete. The first stage was the seizure of power in the cities and the establishment of the Soviet form of government. The second stage was one which is fundamental for all socialists and without which socialists are not socialists, namely, to single out the proletarian and semi-proletarian elements in the rural districts and to ally them to the urban proletariat in order to wage the struggle against the bourgeoisie in the countryside. This stage is also in the main completed. The organisations we originally created for this purpose, the Poor Peasants' Committees, had become so consolidated that we found it possible to replace them by properly elected Soviets, i.e., to reorganise the village Soviets so as to make them the organs of class rule, the organs of proletarian power in the rural districts. Such measures as the law on socialist land settlement and the measures for the transition to socialist farming, which was passed not very long ago by the Central Executive Committee and with which everybody is, of course, familiar, sum up our experience from the point of view of our proletarian revolution.

The main thing, the prime and basic task of the proletarian revolution, we have already accomplished. And precisely because we have accomplished it, a more complicated problem has come to the fore—*our attitude towards the middle peasants*. And whoever thinks that the prominence being given this problem is in any way symptomatic of a weakening of the character of our government, of a weakening of the dictatorship of the proletariat, that it is symptomatic of a

change, however partial, however minute, in our basic policy, completely fails to understand the aims of the proletariat and the aims of the communist revolution. I am convinced that there are no such people in our Party. I only wanted to warn the comrades against people not belonging to the workers' party who will talk in this way, not because it follows from any system of ideas, but because they merely want to spoil things for us and to help the whiteguards—or, to put it more simply, to incite against us the middle peasant, who is always vacillating, who cannot help vacillating, and who will continue to vacillate for a fairly long time to come. In order to incite the middle peasant against us they will say, "See, they are making advances to you! That means they have taken your revolts into account, they are beginning to wobble", and so on and so forth. All our comrades must be armed against agitation of this kind. And I am certain that they will be armed—provided we succeed now in having this question treated from the standpoint of the class struggle.

It is perfectly obvious that this fundamental problem—*how precisely to define the attitude of the proletariat towards the middle peasants*—is a more complex but no less urgent problem. Comrades, from the theoretical point of view, which has been mastered by the vast majority of the workers, this question presents no difficulty to Marxists. I will remind you, for instance, that in his book on the agrarian question, written at a time when he was still correctly expounding the teachings of Marx and was regarded as an indisputed authority in this field, Kautsky states in connection with the transition from capitalism to socialism that the task of a socialist party *is to neutralise the peasants*, i.e., to see to it that in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie the peasant should remain neutral and should not be able to give active assistance to the bourgeoisie against us.

Throughout the extremely long period of the rule of the bourgeoisie, the peasants sided with the bourgeoisie and supported their power. This will be understood if you consider the economic strength of the bourgeoisie and the political instruments of their rule. We cannot count on the middle peasant coming over to our side immediately. But if we pursue a correct policy, after a time these vacillations will cease

and the peasant will be able to come over to our side.

It was Engels—who together with Marx laid the foundations of scientific Marxism, that is, the teachings by which our Party has always guided itself, and particularly in time of revolution—it was Engels who established the division of the peasants into small peasants, middle peasants, and big peasants, and this division holds good for most European countries even today. Engels said, "Perhaps it will not everywhere be necessary to suppress even the big peasant by force." And that we might ever use force in respect of the middle peasant (the small peasant is our friend) is a thought that has never occurred to any sensible socialist. That is what Engels said in 1894, a year before his death, when the agrarian question came to the fore.⁴³ This point of view expresses a truth which is sometimes forgotten, but with which we are all in theory agreed. In relation to the landowners and the capitalists our aim is complete expropriation. *But we shall not tolerate any use of force in respect of the middle peasants.* Even in respect of the rich peasants we do not say as resolutely as we do of the bourgeoisie—absolute expropriation of the rich peasants and the kulaks. This distinction is made in our programme. We say that the resistance of the counter-revolutionary efforts of the rich peasants must be suppressed. That is not complete expropriation.

The basic difference in our attitude towards the bourgeoisie and the middle peasant—complete expropriation of the bourgeoisie and an alliance with the middle peasant who does not exploit others—this basic line is accepted by everybody in theory. But this line is not consistently followed in practice; the people in the localities have not yet learned to follow it. When, after having overthrown the bourgeoisie and consolidated its own power, the proletariat started from various angles to create a new society, the question of the middle peasant came to the fore. Not a single socialist in the world denied that the building of communism would take different courses in countries where large-scale farming prevails and in countries where small-scale farming prevails. That is an elementary truth, an ABC. And from this truth it follows that as we approach the problems of communist construction our principal attention must to a

certain extent be concentrated precisely on the middle peasant.

Much will depend on how we define our attitude towards the middle peasant. Theoretically, that question has been solved; but we know perfectly well from our own experience that there is a difference between solving a problem theoretically and putting the solution into practice. We are now directly confronted with that difference, which was so characteristic of the great French Revolution, when the French Convention launched into sweeping measures but did not possess the necessary support to put them into effect, and did not even know on what class to rely for the implementation of any particular measure.

Our position is an infinitely more fortunate one. Thanks to a whole century of development, we know on which class we are relying. But we also know that the practical experience of that class is extremely inadequate. The fundamental aim was clear to the working class and the workers' party—to overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie and to transfer power to the workers. But *how* was that to be done? Everyone remembers with what difficulty and at the cost of how many mistakes we passed from workers' control to workers' management of industry. And yet that was work within our own class, among the proletarians, with whom we had always had to deal. But now we are called upon to define our attitude towards a new class, a class the urban worker does not know. We have to determine our attitude towards a class which has no definite and stable position. The proletariat in the mass is in favour of socialism, the bourgeoisie in the mass are opposed to socialism. It is easy to determine the relations between these two classes. But when we come up against people like the middle peasants we find that *they are a class that vacillates*. The middle peasant is partly a property-owner and partly a working man. He does not exploit other working people. For decades the middle peasant defended his position with the greatest difficulty, he suffered the exploitation of the landowners and the capitalists, he bore everything. Yet he is a property-owner. Our attitude towards this vacillating class therefore presents enormous difficulties. In the light of more than a year's experience, in the light of more than six months' proletarian work in the

rural districts, and in the light of the class differentiation in the rural districts that has already taken place, we must most of all beware here lest we are too hasty, lest we are inadequately theoretical, lest we regard what is in process of being accomplished, but has not yet been realised, as having been accomplished. In the resolution which is being proposed to you by the commission elected by the committee, and which will be read to you by a subsequent speaker, you will find sufficient warning against this.

From the economic point of view, it is obvious that we must help the middle peasant. Theoretically, there is no doubt of this. But because of our habits, our level of culture, the inadequacy of the cultural and technical forces we are in a position to place at the disposal of the rural districts, and because of the helpless manner in which we often approach the rural districts, comrades frequently resort to coercion and thus spoil everything. Only yesterday a comrade gave me a pamphlet entitled *Instructions and Regulations on Party Work in Nizhni-Novgorod Gubernia*, issued by the Nizhni-Novgorod Committee of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), and in this pamphlet, for example, I find this on p. 41. "The whole burden of the emergency tax decree must be placed on the shoulders of the village kulaks and profiteers and *the middle element of the peasants generally*."⁴⁴ Well, well! These people have indeed "understood". This is either a printer's error—and it is impermissible that such printer's errors should be made—or a piece of rushed, hasty work, which shows how dangerous all haste is in this matter. Or—and this is the worst surmise of all, one I would not like to make with regard to the Nizhni-Novgorod comrades—they have simply failed to understand. It may very well be that it is an oversight.

We have, in practice, cases like the one related by a comrade in the commission. He was surrounded by peasants, and every one of them asked: "Tell me, am I a middle peasant or not? I have two horses and one cow.... I have two cows and one horse", etc. And this agitator, who tours the uyezds, is expected to possess an infallible thermometer with which to gauge every peasant and say whether he is a middle peasant or not. To do that you must know the whole history of the given peasant's farm, his relation to higher

and lower groups—and we cannot know that accurately.

Considerable practical ability and knowledge of local conditions are required here, and we do not yet possess them. You need not be ashamed to confess it; it must be admitted frankly. We were never utopians and never imagined that we would build communist society with the immaculate hands of immaculate Communists, born and educated in an immaculately communist society. That is a fairy-tale. We have to build communism out of the debris of capitalism, and only the class which has been steeled in the struggle against capitalism can do that. The proletariat, as you are very well aware, is not free from the shortcomings and weaknesses of capitalist society. It is fighting for socialism, but at the same time it is fighting against its own shortcomings. The best and foremost section of the proletariat, which carried on a desperate struggle in the cities for decades, was in a position to acquire in the course of that struggle the culture of life in the capital and other cities, and to a certain extent did acquire it. You know that even in advanced countries the rural districts were condemned to ignorance. Of course, we shall raise the level of culture in the rural districts, but that will be the work of many, many years, that is what our comrades everywhere are forgetting and what is being strikingly brought home to us by every word uttered by people who come from the rural districts; not by the intellectuals who work here, not by the officials—we have listened to them a lot—but by people who have in practice observed the work in the rural districts. It was these opinions that we found particularly valuable in the agrarian committee. These opinions will be particularly valuable now—I am convinced of that—for the whole Party Congress, for they come not from books, and not from decrees, but from experience.

All this obliges us to work for the purpose of introducing the greatest possible clarity into our attitude towards the middle peasant. This is very difficult, because *such clarity does not exist in reality*. Not only is this problem unsolved, it is *insoluble*, if you want to solve it *immediately and all at once*. There are people who say that there was no need to write so many decrees. They blame the Soviet Government for setting about writing decrees without knowing how they

were to be put into effect. These people, as a matter of fact, do not realise that they are sinking to the whiteguard position. If we had expected that life in the rural districts could be completely changed by writing a hundred decrees, we would have been absolute idiots. But if we had refrained from indicating in decrees the road that must be followed, we would have been traitors to socialism. These decrees, while in practice they could not be carried into effect fully and immediately, played an important part as propaganda. While formerly we carried on our propaganda by means of general truths, *we are now carrying on our propaganda by our work.* That is also preaching, but it is preaching by action—only not action in the sense of the isolated sallies of some upstarts, at which we scoffed so much in the era of the anarchists and the socialism of the old type. Our decree is a call, but not the old call "Workers, arise and overthrow the bourgeoisie!" No, it is a call to the people, it calls them to practical work. *Decrees are instructions which call for practical work on a mass scale.* That is what is important. Let us assume that decrees do contain much that is useless, much that in practice cannot be put into effect; but they contain material for practical action, and the purpose of a decree is to teach practical steps to the hundreds, thousands, and millions of people who heed the voice of the Soviet government. This is a trial in practical action in the sphere of socialist construction in the rural districts. If we treat matters in this way we shall acquire a good deal from the sum total of our laws, decrees, and ordinances. We shall not regard them as absolute injunctions which must be put into effect instantly and at all costs.

We must avoid everything that in practice may tend to encourage individual abuses. In places careerists and adventurers have attached themselves to us like leeches, people who call themselves Communists and are deceiving us, and who have wormed their way into our ranks because the Communists are now in power, and because the more honest government employees refused to come and work with us on account of their retrograde ideas, while careerists have no ideas, and no honesty. These people, whose only aim is to make a career, resort in the localities to coercion, and imagine they are doing a good thing. But in fact the result

of this at times is that the peasants say, "Long live Soviet power, but *down with the communia!*" (i.e., communism). This is not an invention; these facts are taken from real life, from the reports of comrades in the localities. We must not forget what enormous damage is always caused by lack of moderation, by all rashness, and haste.

We had to hurry and, by taking a desperate leap, to get out of the imperialist war at any cost, for it had brought us to the verge of collapse. We had to make most desperate efforts to crush the bourgeoisie and the forces that were threatening to crush us. All this was necessary, without this we could not have triumphed. But if we were to act in the same way towards the middle peasant it would be such idiocy, such stupidity, it would be so ruinous to our cause, that only provocateurs could deliberately act in such a way. The aim here must be an entirely different one. Here our aim is not to smash the resistance of obvious exploiters, to defeat and overthrow them—which was the aim we previously set ourselves. No, now that this main purpose has been accomplished, more complicated problems arise. You cannot create anything here by coercion. *Coercion applied to the middle peasants would cause untold harm.* This section is a numerous one, it consists of millions of individuals. Even in Europe, where it nowhere reaches such numbers, where technology and culture, urban life and railways are tremendously developed, and where it would be easiest of all to think of such a thing, nobody, not even the most revolutionary of socialists, has ever proposed adopting measures of coercion towards the middle peasant.

When we were taking power we relied on the support of the peasants as a whole. At that time the aim of all the peasants was the same—to fight the landowners. But their prejudice against large-scale farming has remained to this day. The peasant thinks that if there is a big farm, that means he will again be a farm-hand. That, of course, is a mistake. But the peasant's idea of large-scale farming is associated with a feeling of hatred and the memory of how landowners used to oppress the people. That feeling still remains, it has not yet died.

We must particularly stress the truth that here by the very nature of the case coercive methods can accomplish nothing.

The economic task here is an entirely different one; there is no upper layer that can be cut off, leaving the foundation and the building intact. That upper layer which in the cities was represented by the capitalists does not exist in the villages. *Here coercion would ruin the whole cause.* Prolonged educational work is required. We have to give the peasant, who not only in our country but all over the world is a practical man and a realist, concrete examples to prove that the "communia" is the best possible thing. Of course, nothing will come of it if hasty individuals flit down to a village from a city to chatter and stir up a number of intellectual-like and at times unintellectual-like squabbles, and then quarrel with everyone and go their way. That sometimes happens. Instead of evoking respect, they evoke ridicule, and deservedly so.

On this question we must say that we do encourage communes, but they must be so organised *as to gain the confidence of the peasants.* And until then we are pupils of the peasants and not their teachers. Nothing is more stupid than people who know nothing about farming and its specific features, rushing to the village only because they have heard of the advantages of socialised farming, are tired of urban life and desire to work in rural districts—it is most stupid for such people to regard themselves as teachers of the peasants in every respect. *Nothing is more stupid than the very idea of applying coercion in economic relations with the middle peasant.*

The aim is not to expropriate the middle peasant but to bear in mind the specific conditions in which the peasant lives, to learn from him methods of transition to a better system, *and not to dare to give orders!* That is the rule we have set ourselves. (*General applause.*) That is the rule we have endeavoured to set forth in our draft resolution, for in that respect, comrades, we have indeed sinned a great deal. We are by no means ashamed to confess it. We were inexperienced. Our very struggle against the exploiters was taken from experience. If we have sometimes been condemned on account of it, we can say, "Dear capitalist gentlemen, you have only yourselves to blame. If you had not offered such savage, senseless, insolent, and desperate resistance, if you had not joined in an alliance with the world bourgeois-

sie, the revolution would have assumed more peaceful forms." Now that we have repulsed the savage onslaught on all sides we can change to other methods, because we are acting not as a narrow circle, but as a party which is leading the millions. The millions cannot immediately understand a change of course, and so it frequently happens that blows aimed at the kulaks fall on the middle peasants. That is not surprising. It must only be understood that this is due to historical conditions which have now been outlived and that the new conditions and the new tasks in relation to this class demand a new psychology.

Our decrees on peasant farming are in the main correct. We have no grounds for renouncing a single one of them, or for regretting a single one of them. But if the decrees are right, *it is wrong to impose them on the peasants by force*. That is not contained in a single decree. They are right inasmuch as they indicate the roads to follow, inasmuch as they call to practical measures. When we say, "Encourage associations", we are giving instructions which must be tested many times before the final *form* in which to put them into effect is found. When it is stated that we must strive to gain the peasants' voluntary consent, it means that they must be persuaded, and persuaded by practical deeds. They will not allow themselves to be convinced by mere words, and they are perfectly right in that. It would be a bad thing if they allowed themselves to be convinced merely by reading decrees and agitational leaflets. If it were possible to reshape economic life in this way, such reshaping would not be worth a brass farthing. It must first be proved that such association is better, people must be united in such a way that they become actually united and are not at odds with each other—it must be proved that association is advantageous. That is the way the peasant puts the question and that is the way our decrees put it. If we have not been able to achieve that so far, there is nothing to be ashamed of and we must admit it frankly.

We have so far accomplished only the fundamental task of every socialist revolution—that of defeating the bourgeoisie. That in the main has been accomplished, although an extremely difficult half-year is beginning in which the imperialists of the world are making a last attempt to crush us.

We can now say without in the least exaggerating that *they themselves understand that after this half-year their cause will be absolutely hopeless*. Either they take advantage now of our state of exhaustion and defeat us, an isolated country, or we emerge victorious not merely in regard to our country alone. In this half-year, in which the food crisis has been aggravated by a transport crisis, and in which the imperialist powers are endeavouring to attack us on several fronts, our situation is extremely difficult. But *this is the last difficult half-year*. We must continue to mobilise all our forces in the struggle against the external enemy who is attacking us.

But when we speak of the aims of our work in the rural districts, in spite of all the difficulties, and in spite of the fact that our experience has been wholly concerned with the immediate task of crushing the exploiters, we must remember, and never forget, that our aims in the rural districts, in relation to the middle peasant, are entirely different.

All the class-conscious workers—from Petrograd, Ivanovo-Voznesensk, or Moscow—who have been to the rural districts related examples of how a number of misunderstandings which appeared to be irremovable, and a number of conflicts which appeared to be very serious, were removed or mitigated when intelligent working men came forward and spoke, not in the bookish language, but in a language understood by the peasants, when they spoke not as commanders who take the liberty of giving orders without knowing anything of rural life, but as comrades, explaining the situation and appealing to their sentiments as working people against the exploiters. And by such comradely explanation they accomplished what could not be accomplished by hundreds of others who conducted themselves like commanders and superiors.

That is the spirit that permeates the resolution we are now submitting to you.

I have endeavoured in my brief report to dwell on the underlying principles, on the general political significance of this resolution. I have endeavoured to show—and I should like to think that I have succeeded—that from the point of view of the interests of the revolution as a whole we are

making no change of policy, we are not changing the line. The whiteguards and their henchmen are shouting, or will shout, that we are. Let them shout. We do not care. We are pursuing our aims in a most consistent manner. We must transfer our attention from the aim of suppressing the bourgeoisie to the aim of arranging the life of the middle peasant. We must live in peace with him. In a communist society the middle peasants will be on our side only when we alleviate and improve their economic conditions. If tomorrow we could supply one hundred thousand first-class tractors, provide them with fuel, provide them with drivers—you know very well that this at present is sheer fantasy—the middle peasant would say, “I am for the communia” (i.e., for communism). But in order to do that we must first defeat the international bourgeoisie, we must compel them to give us these tractors, or so develop our productive forces as to be able to provide them ourselves. That is the only correct way to pose this question.

The peasant needs the industry of the towns; he cannot live without it, and it is in our hands. If we set about the task properly, the peasant will be grateful to us for bringing him these products, these implements and this culture from the towns. They will be brought to him not by exploiters, not by landowners, but by his fellow-workers, whom he values very highly, but values in a practical manner, for the actual help they give, at the same time rejecting—and quite rightly rejecting—all domineering and “orders” from above.

First help, and then endeavour to win confidence. If you set about this task correctly, if every step taken by every one of our groups in the uyezds, the volosts, the food procurement groups, and in every other organisation is made properly, if every step of ours is carefully checked from this point of view, we shall gain the confidence of the peasant, and only then shall we be able to proceed farther. What we must now do is to help him and advise him. This will not be the orders of a commander, but the advice of a comrade. The peasant will then be entirely on our side.

This, comrades, is what is contained in our resolution, and this, in my opinion, must become the decision of the Congress. If we adopt this, if it serves to determine the work

of all our Party organisations, we shall cope with the second great task before us.

We have learned how to overthrow the bourgeoisie, how to suppress them, and we are proud of the fact. But we have not yet learned how to regulate our relations with the millions of middle peasants, how to win their confidence, and we must frankly admit it. But we have understood the task, we have set it, and we say in all confidence, with full knowledge and determination, that we shall cope with this task—and then socialism will be absolutely invincible. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Published according to
the verbatim report
corrected by Lenin

7

SPEECH IN OPPOSITION TO A MOTION
TO CLOSE THE DEBATE
ON THE REPORT ON WORK IN THE COUNTRYSIDE
MARCH 23

Comrades, I cannot possibly agree with the preceding speaker, because I am sure that under no circumstances will you go straight to work in the rural districts after this evening. We members of the commission assumed that we were not speaking at this Congress only for the benefit of the gathering in this small hall, but for the benefit of the whole of Russia, which will not only peruse the decisions of our Congress, but will also want to know how much interest the Party is displaying in the question of work in the rural districts. Therefore, it is necessary to hear what the comrades from the districts have to say. If you spend an hour or an hour and a half on this, the work in the rural districts will not suffer in the least. Therefore, on behalf of the commission, I earnestly request that you do not grudge this hour or hour and a half. It is not likely that the practical workers who will speak here will add much that is new, but for the newspaper-reading public all over Russia these few hours of our work will be very beneficial.

8

RESOLUTION
ON THE ATTITUDE TO THE MIDDLE PEASANTS

Basing itself on the Party Programme adopted on March 22, 1919, insofar as it concerns work in the rural areas, and giving full support to the law already promulgated by the Soviet government on socialist land settlement and the measures for the transition to socialist farming, the Eighth Congress recognises that at the present time it is particularly important to adhere more strictly to the line of the Party in respect of the middle peasants, to display a more considerate attitude towards their needs, end arbitrary action on the part of the local authorities, and make an effort towards agreement with them.

1) To confuse the middle peasants with the kulaks and to extend to them in one or another degree measures directed against the kulaks is to violate most flagrantly not only all the decrees of the Soviet government and its entire policy, but also all the basic principles of communism, according to which agreement between the proletariat and the middle peasants is one of the conditions for a painless transition to the abolition of all exploitation in the period of decisive struggle waged by the proletariat to overthrow the bourgeoisie.

2) The middle peasants, who have comparatively strong economic roots owing to the lagging of agricultural techniques behind industrial techniques even in the leading capitalist countries, to say nothing of Russia, will continue to exist for quite a long time after the beginning of the proletarian revolution. Therefore, the tactics of the functionaries of the Soviets in the villages, as well as of Party functionaries,

must envisage a long period of co-operation with the middle peasants.

3) The Party must at all costs ensure that all Soviet functionaries in the countryside have a clear and thorough grasp of the axiom of scientific socialism that the middle peasants are not exploiters since they do not profit by the labour of others. Such a class of small producers cannot lose by socialism, but, on the contrary, will gain a great deal by casting off the yoke of capital which exploits it in a thousand different ways even in a most democratic republic.

The correctly applied policy of Soviet power in the countryside, therefore, ensures alliance and agreement between the victorious proletariat and the middle peasants.

4) While encouraging co-operatives of all kinds as well as agricultural communes of middle peasants, representatives of Soviet power must not allow the slightest coercion to be used in setting them up. Associations are only worth while when they have been set up by the peasants themselves, on their own initiative, and the benefits of them have been verified in practice. Undue haste in this matter is harmful, for it can only strengthen prejudices against innovations among the middle peasants.

Representatives of Soviet power who permit themselves to employ not only direct but even indirect compulsion to bring peasants into communes must be brought strictly to account and removed from work in the countryside.

5) All arbitrary requisitioning, i.e., requisitioning not in conformity with the exact provisions of laws issued by the central authority, must be ruthlessly punished. The Congress insists on the strengthening of control in this field by the People's Commissariat of Agriculture, People's Commissariat of the Interior, and the All-Russia Central Executive Committee.

6) At the present time the extreme chaos which has been caused in all countries of the world by the four years of imperialist war in the predatory interests of the capitalists, and which has become particularly acute in Russia, places the middle peasants in a difficult position.

In view of this, the law issued by the Soviet government on the emergency tax, as distinct from all the laws issued by all the bourgeois governments in the world, makes a point

of laying the burden of the tax wholly on the kulaks, the inconsiderable number of peasant exploiters who particularly enriched themselves during the war. The middle peasants must be taxed very mildly, so that the sum levied is fully within their means and not burdensome to them.

The Party demands, in any case, lenience towards the middle peasants in collecting the emergency tax, even if this reduces the total revenue.

7) The socialist state must extend the widest possible aid to the peasants, mainly by supplying the middle peasants with products of urban industries and, especially, improved agricultural implements, seed and various materials in order to raise efficiency in agriculture and ensure improvement of the peasants' working and living conditions.

If the present economic chaos does not allow the immediate and full implementation of these measures, it remains the duty of local Soviet authorities to explore all possible avenues to render the poor and middle peasants any real aid to support them at the present difficult moment. The Party finds it necessary to establish a large state fund for this purpose.

8) In particular, efforts must be made to give real and full effect to the law issued by the Soviet government which requires of state farms, agricultural communes, and all other similar associations that they render immediate and all-round assistance to the middle peasants in their neighbourhood. Only on the basis of such actual assistance is it possible to achieve agreement with the middle peasants. Only in this way can and must their confidence be won.

The Congress draws the attention of all Party workers to the need to put into effect immediately all the points set forth in the agrarian section of the Party Programme, namely:

(a) regulation of the use of land by the peasants (elimination of scattered holdings, the open field system, etc.), (b) supply of improved seeds and artificial fertilisers to the peasants, (c) improvement of the breeds of the peasants' livestock, (d) spreading of agronomical knowledge, (e) agronomical assistance to the peasants, (f) repair of the peasants' farm implements at repair shops belonging to the Soviets, (g) organisation of centres hiring out implements, experi-

mental stations, model fields, etc., (h) improvements to the peasants' land.

9) Peasants' co-operative associations with the object of increasing agricultural production, and especially of processing farm produce, improvements to the peasants' land, support of handicraft industries, etc., must be accorded extensive aid, both financial and organisational, by the state.

10) The Congress reminds all concerned that neither the decisions of the Party nor the decrees of Soviet power have ever deviated from the line of agreement with the middle peasants. In the cardinal matter of the organisation of Soviet power in the countryside, for instance, a circular letter signed by the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and the People's Commissar for Food was issued when the Poor Peasants' Committees were established, pointing to the need to include in these Committees representatives of the middle peasants. When the Poor Peasants' Committees were abolished, the All-Russia Congress of Soviets again pointed to the need to include representatives of the middle peasants in the volost Soviets. The policy of the workers' and peasants' government and the Communist Party must in the future too be permeated by this spirit of agreement between the proletariat and the poor peasants on the one hand, and the middle peasants on the other.

9

SPEECH CLOSING THE CONGRESS
MARCH 23

Comrades, all the items on our agenda have been dealt with. Permit me to say a few words in closing the Congress.

Comrades, it is not only the loss of one of our best organisers and practical leaders, Yakov Mikhailovich Sverdlov, that has made the time at which we assembled here a very difficult one. It is a particularly difficult time because international imperialism is making a last and exceptionally strenuous effort to crush the Soviet Republic—of this there is now no doubt. We do not doubt that the fierce attacks launched in the West and the East, accompanied as they are by a number of whiteguard revolts and attempts to dismantle the railway line in several places, are deliberate measures apparently decided on in Paris by the Entente imperialists. We all know, comrades, how difficult it was for Russia, after four years of imperialist war, to take up arms in defence of the Soviet Republic against the imperialist plunderers. We all know what a burden this war is, how it is exhausting us. But we also know that this war is being fought with redoubled vigour and dauntless courage only because for the first time in world history, an army, an armed force, has been created, which knows what it is fighting for; and because, for the first time in world history, workers and peasants are making incredible sacrifices in the knowledge that they are defending the Soviet Socialist Republic, the rule of the working people over the capitalists; they know that they are defending the cause of the world proletarian socialist revolution.

Amidst these difficult conditions we accomplished a great deal in a very short time. We managed to endorse our programme unanimously, as was the case with every vital decision of the Congress. We are convinced that in spite of its numerous literary and other shortcomings, this programme has already gone into the history of the Third International as the programme which sums up the results of the new stage in the world movement for the emancipation of the proletariat. We are convinced that in many countries, where we have far more allies and friends than we imagine, the mere translation of our programme will provide the most effective answer to the question as to what has been done by the Russian Communist Party, which is one of the units of the international proletariat. Our programme will serve as extremely effective material for propaganda and agitation; it is a document which will lead the workers to say, "Here are our comrades, our brothers; here our common cause is becoming reality."

Comrades, we succeeded in passing a number of other important decisions at this Congress. We approved of the formation of the Third, Communist International, which was founded here in Moscow. We adopted a unanimous decision on the military question. Vast though the differences of opinion may have appeared at first, diverse as may have been the views of the many comrades who very frankly criticised the shortcomings of our military policy, we on the commission found no difficulty in arriving at an absolutely unanimous decision, and we shall leave this Congress convinced that our chief defender, the Red Army, for the sake of which the whole country is making such incalculable sacrifices, will find in every delegate to the Congress, in every member of the Party, a warm, unselfish and devoted assistant, leader, friend and collaborator.

Comrades, we were able to solve the organisational problems confronting us with such ease because the solutions had been indicated by the entire history of the relations between the Party and the Soviets. All we were called upon to do was sum up. On the subject of our work in the rural districts, the Congress, in a unanimous decision speedily arrived at, laid down our policy on a question that is particularly important and particularly difficult, and one that

in other countries is even regarded as insoluble—the attitude of the proletariat which has overthrown the bourgeoisie towards the vast masses of middle peasants. We are all convinced that this Congress decision will help to consolidate our power. We are convinced that in the trying period through which we are now passing, when the imperialists are making their final effort to overthrow the Soviet government by force, and when an acute food shortage and the chaotic state of the transport have once again rendered the position of hundreds, thousands and millions of people desperate, the resolution we adopted and the spirit which animated the delegates to this Congress will help us to bear these trials and to live through this difficult half-year.

We are convinced that *this will be the last difficult half-year*. This conviction of ours is greatly strengthened by the news we announced to the Congress the other day—the news of the success of the proletarian revolution in Hungary. Up to now Soviet power has been victorious in only one country, among the peoples which once constituted the former Russian Empire; and short-sighted people, who found it exceptionally difficult to abandon routine and old habits of thought (even though they may have belonged to the socialist camp), imagined that this surprising swing towards proletarian Soviet democracy was due entirely to the peculiar conditions prevailing in Russia; they thought that perhaps the specific features of this democracy reflected, as in a distorting mirror, the peculiar features of former, tsarist Russia. If there was ever any foundation for such an opinion, there is certainly none whatever now. Comrades, the news received today gives us a picture of the Hungarian revolution. We learn from today's news that the Allied powers have presented a brutal ultimatum to Hungary demanding free passage for their troops. The bourgeois government, seeing that the Allied powers wanted to move their troops through Hungary, seeing that Hungary would be subjected to the frightful sufferings of a new war—this government of bourgeois compromisers voluntarily resigned, voluntarily opened negotiations with the Communists, our Hungarian comrades, who were in prison, and voluntarily admitted that there was no way out of the situation except by transferring power to the working people. (*Applause.*)

It was said that we were usurpers. At the end of 1917 and the beginning of 1918, the only words with which the bourgeoisie and many of their followers described our revolution were "violence" and "usurpation". Even now we hear statements to the effect that the Bolshevik government is holding on by force, although we have repeatedly demonstrated that this is absurd. But if such absurdities could be uttered in the past, they have now been silenced by what has occurred in Hungary. Even the bourgeoisie has realised that there can be no government authority except that of the Soviets. The bourgeoisie of a more cultured country sees more clearly than our bourgeoisie did on the eve of October 25 that the country is perishing, that trials of increasing severity are being imposed on the people, and that, therefore, political power must be transferred to the Soviets, that the workers and peasants of Hungary, the new, Soviet, proletarian democracy must save her.

Comrades, the difficulties which face the Hungarian revolution are immense. Hungary is a small country compared with Russia and can be stifled by the imperialists much more easily. However great the difficulties which undoubtedly still face Hungary, we have achieved a *moral victory* in addition to a victory for Soviet power. A most radical, democratic and compromising bourgeoisie realised that at a moment of extreme crisis, when a new war is menacing a country already exhausted by war, a Soviet government is a historical necessity, that in such a country there can be no government but a Soviet government, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Comrades, behind us there is a long line of revolutionaries who sacrificed their lives for the emancipation of Russia. The lot of the majority of these revolutionaries was a hard one. They suffered the persecution of the tsarist government, but it was not their good fortune to see the triumph of the revolution. A better fortune has fallen to our lot. Not only have we seen the triumph of our revolution, not only have we seen it become consolidated amidst unprecedented difficulties, create new forms of government and win the sympathy of the whole world, but we are also seeing the seed sown by the Russian revolution springing up in Europe. This imbues us with the absolute and unshakable conviction that no mat-

ter how difficult the trials that may still befall us, and no matter how great the misfortunes that may be brought upon us by that dying beast, international imperialism, that beast will perish, and socialism will triumph throughout the world. (*Prolonged applause.*)

I declare the Eighth Congress of the Russian Communist Party closed.

**WIRELESS MESSAGE OF GREETING
TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF THE HUNGARIAN SOVIET REPUBLIC
MARCH 22, 1919**

This is Lenin. Sincere greetings to the proletarian government of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, and especially to Comrade Béla Kun.⁴⁵ I conveyed your greetings to the Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks). They were received with tremendous enthusiasm. We shall send you the decisions of the Moscow Congress of the Third, Communist International, as well as a report on the military situation, as soon as possible. It is absolutely necessary to maintain constant radio communication between Budapest and Moscow. Accept my communist greetings and hearty handshake, *Lenin*.

First published in Hungarian
in the newspaper *Népszava* No. 70,
March 23, 1919

Published according to
the Russian translation

RECORD OF WIRELESS MESSAGE TO BÉLA KUN MARCH 23, 1919

Lenin to Béla Kun in Budapest

Please inform us what real guarantees you have that the new Hungarian Government will actually be a communist, and not simply a socialist, government, i.e., one of traitor-socialists.

Have the Communists a majority in the government? When will the Congress of Soviets take place? What does the socialists' recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat really amount to?

It is altogether beyond doubt that it would be a mistake merely to imitate our Russian tactics in all details in the specific conditions of the Hungarian revolution. I must warn you against this mistake, but I should like to know where you see real guarantees.

So that I may be certain that the answer has come to me from you personally, I ask you to indicate in what sense I spoke to you about the National Assembly when you last visited me in the Kremlin.

With communist greetings,
Lenin

Published according to
the manuscript

REPLY TO AN OPEN LETTER BY A BOURGEOIS SPECIALIST

Today I received the following:

"An open letter of a 'specialist' to Comrade Lenin.

"I read in *Izvestia* your report on the specialists, and I cannot suppress a cry of indignation. Don't you really understand that not a single honest specialist, if he has retained the least shred of self-respect, can agree to go to work merely for the sake of the animal comforts with which you are offering to provide him? Have you retired so deeply into the seclusion of the Kremlin that you fail to see the life that is going around you, that you do not see how many of the Russian specialists, though not government Communists, are real workers, who acquired their special knowledge at the cost of extreme effort not from the capitalists and not for the purpose of making money, but in persistent struggle against the deadly conditions of student and academic life under the old system? These conditions have not been improved for them under the communist government (to me this does not coincide with my conception of the communist system). Against these absolutely genuine proletarians—even though they come from different classes—who have served the working people by word, deed and thought from the very first days of their conscious life—against these, whom you lump together in a single contaminated heap of 'intellectuals', you incite ignorant, upstart Communists, former policemen, minor officials and shopkeepers, who in the provinces often constitute a large section of the 'local authorities', and it is difficult to describe the horrors of the humiliation and suffering they are experiencing. Continuous denunciation and accusations of the absurdest description, fruitless but extremely humiliating house searches, threats of shooting, requisitions and confiscations, invasion of the most private sides of personal life (a commander of a unit quartered in an educational establishment at which I teach actually ordered me to sleep in one bed with my wife), these are the conditions under which many specialists in establishments of higher learning were compelled to work until very lately. But all these 'petty-bourgeois' have remained at their posts and faithfully fulfilled the moral obligations they undertook to preserve, no matter at what sacrifice,

culture and knowledge for those who humiliated and insulted them at the instigation of their leaders. They realised that their personal misfortunes and sorrows must not be confused with the question of building a new and better life; and this helped, and is helping them now, to bear it, and continue with their work.

"But believe me, from among these people whom you, without discrimination, have christened bourgeois, counter-revolutionaries, saboteurs, and so forth, only because they conceive of the approach to the future socialist and communist system differently from the way you and your disciples conceive of it, you will not buy a single man at the price that you think of offering. After all, the 'specialists' who go to work for you in order to save their skins will not benefit the country in any way. A specialist is not a machine. He cannot be simply wound up and set going. Without inspiration, without the internal spark of life, without the urge to create, not a single specialist will produce anything, no matter how highly he is paid. But a volunteer, working and creating among comrades and collaborators who respect him and regard him as a guide who knows his business, and not as a suspect to be kept under the surveillance of a communist commissar of the 1919 crop, will put his heart and soul into his work.

"If you don't want to have 'specialists' working merely for the sake of their salary, if you want new, honest volunteers to join the specialists who are already co-operating with you in some places, not out of fear, but conscientiously, in spite of the fact that they disagree with you on principle on many questions, in spite of the humiliating conditions into which your tactics often place them, in spite of the unprecedented bureaucratic chaos that reigns in many Soviet offices and which sometimes wrecks even most vital undertakings—if you want all this, then first of all purge your Party and your government offices of the unscrupulous *Mitläufer*,* comb out these self-seekers, adventurers, scoundrels and bandits who, sheltering under the banners of communism, are either, owing to their despicable natures, grabbing public property, or, owing to their stupidity, are cutting at the roots of public life by their absurd, disruptive fussiness.

"If you want to 'use' the specialists, do not buy them, but learn to respect them as men, and not as livestock and machines that you need for a certain time.

* *M. Dukelsky,*

"Professor at Voronezh Agricultural Institute. President of the Central Board of State Enterprises in the Leather Industry."

* Casual fellow-travellers.—*Ed.*

This is a wrathful letter, but I think it is sincere, and one I would like to answer.

After all is said and done, I think the author is governed mainly by personal irritation, which has robbed him of the ability to discuss events from the mass point of view, and from the point of view of their actual consecutiveness.

According to the author, we Communists repelled the specialists by "christening" them with all sorts of bad names.

This was not the case.

The workers and peasants set up the Soviet government after overthrowing the bourgeoisie and bourgeois parliamentarism. It is not difficult to see today that this was not a "gamble", not an "act of folly" on the part of the Bolsheviks, but the beginning of a world-wide change of two eras in world history—the era of the bourgeoisie and the era of socialism, the era of capitalist parliamentarism and the era of the Soviet state institutions of the proletariat. If, a year or so ago, the majority of the intellectuals would not (and partly could not) see this, are we to blame?

The sabotage was started by the intelligentsia and the government officials, the bulk of whom are bourgeois and petty bourgeois. These terms are a class characterisation, a historical appraisal, which may be right or wrong, but which must not be regarded as terms of abuse, or vituperation. It was inevitable that the workers and peasants should be enraged by the sabotage of the intelligentsia, and if anybody is to "blame" for this, it can only be the bourgeoisie and their willing and unwilling accomplices.

Had we "incited" anybody against the "intelligentsia", we would have deserved to be hanged for it. Far from inciting the people against the intelligentsia, we on the contrary, in the name of the Party, and in the name of the government, urged the necessity of creating the best possible working conditions for the intelligentsia. I have been doing this since April 1918, if not earlier. I do not know which issue of *Izvestia* the author refers to, but it is very strange for a man who is accustomed to study politics, that is to say, to analyse events, from the mass and not from the personal point of view, to hear that to advocate higher pay necessarily expresses the unworthy, or generally evil, desire to "buy". I hope the respected author will forgive me for saying so, but,

on my word of honour, this reminded me of that literary character the "Muslin Miss".*

Let us assume that the question is one of paying high salaries to a special, hand-picked group, that is, a group which formerly, for general social reasons, did not, and could not receive higher salaries. In that case, there might be grounds for assuming that the government's object is to "buy" this group. But when we are discussing hundreds of thousands, if not millions, who *always* received higher salaries, how is it possible to regard the proposal that it is necessary, for a time, to pay a lower, but higher than the average, salary as a snare, or an "insult" unless one wishes to adopt a tone of furious irritation and carping criticism of everything.

Not only is his whole argument incongruous, but the author defeats himself when he relates, as of some great wrong done to him, as of some deep humiliation, the case when the commander of a unit quartered in a certain educational establishment ordered the professor to sleep in one bed with his wife!

Firstly, to the extent that the desire of intellectual people to have two beds, a bed for the husband and one for the wife, is legitimate (and it is undoubtedly legitimate), to that extent, it is necessary to have a salary higher than the average to satisfy that desire. The author of the letter cannot but know that on the "average" the number of beds in Russia was always less than one per Russian citizen!

Secondly, was the commander of the unit wrong in *this* case? If he was not rude, offensive, and did not deliberately humiliate the professor, and so forth (which *might have been* the case, and for which he should have been punished), if, I repeat, this was *not the case*, then, in my opinion, *he was right*. The men were worn out, they had not seen a bed, or probably a decent lodging in general, for months on end. They are defending the Socialist Republic under incredible difficulties, under inhuman conditions; did they not have a right to take a bed for a short time to rest in? The soldiers and their commander were right.

* This expression was current in Russia in the nineteenth century; it was applied to young girls with limited interests brought up on patriarchal country estates.—Ed.

We do not want to reduce the general conditions of life of the intellectuals to the average, at one stroke, and consequently we are opposed to reducing their salaries to the average. But everything must be subordinated to the needs of the war, and intellectuals must put up with some inconvenience so that the soldiers may be able to rest. This is not a humiliating, but a just demand.

The author demands that intellectuals should be treated like comrades. He is right. We demand that too. The programme of our Party contains such a demand clearly, plainly and precisely formulated. If, on the other hand, groups of non-Party intellectuals, or of intellectuals who because of their party allegiance are politically hostile to the Bolsheviks, as clearly formulate the demand to their adherents, "be comradely towards weary soldiers, and towards over-worked workers who are enraged by centuries of exploitation", then manual and non-manual workers will draw closer together at an extremely rapid rate.

The author demands that we should purge our Party and government offices of "unscrupulous, casual fellow-travelers, of self-seekers, adventurers, scoundrels and bandits".

That is a just demand. We ourselves put it forward long ago, and are fulfilling it. We are not giving a free run to "newcomers" in our Party. The Party Congress even decided on a re-registration of members.⁴⁶ We shoot all bandits, self-seekers and adventurers that we catch, and will continue to do so. But if this process of purging is to proceed more thoroughly and quickly, sincere non-Party intellectuals must help us. When they form groups of people personally acquainted with each other, and in their name call for loyal service in Soviet offices, call upon them to "serve the working people", to use the term of the open letter, then the birth-pangs of the new social order will be much shortened and eased.

N. Lenin

March 27, 1919

**ON THE CANDIDACY OF M. I. KALININ
FOR THE POST OF CHAIRMAN
OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

**SPEECH AT THE TWELFTH SESSION
OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MARCH 30, 1919**

Comrades! To find a person who could take the place of Comrade Yakov Mikhailovich Sverdlov in full is an exceedingly difficult task, for it is next to impossible for any one man to be at once a leading Party worker, moreover one who knows the history of the Party, and an excellent judge of people capable of choosing leading functionaries for the Soviets. It would be impossible to expect any one comrade to assume all the functions that Comrade Sverdlov took care of alone—on this all were agreed when candidacies were discussed in the Party—and hence we shall have to entrust the various functions to whole collegiums that will meet daily and direct the different spheres of work. As far as the chairman is concerned, we must ensure that he expresses the Party line in respect of the peasantry.

You know that our approach to the middle peasants as set forth at the Party Congress introduces no change in our general policy. The tasks we have outlined in regard to the middle peasants must be carried out once our primary problem—the suppression of the bourgeoisie—has been solved. The question of the attitude to the middle peasants is a more acute problem for us than for our comrades in Europe, and we must make sure that we have at the head of the Soviet state a comrade who can demonstrate that our decision in this matter will really be carried out.

I believe that we can and must find a comrade who will devote himself wholly to carrying out the line of the leading Party in respect of the middle peasants. We know that at present the problem of gathering and transmitting information is particularly acute. We know that the break-down of transport facilities and the existence of civil war, which at times interrupts communications between the centre and entire regions, not to speak of separate gubernias—we know that under the circumstances this problem requires special attention.

We know that we can solve this problem if we find a comrade with the necessary experience and knowledge of the life of the middle peasants, and I believe that the candidacy of which you read in today's papers meets all these requirements. This is the candidacy of Comrade Kalinin.

Here we have a comrade who has been engaged in Party work for nearly twenty years. He is a peasant from Tver Gubernia, who has close connections with peasant farming which he constantly renews and freshens. Petrograd workers have witnessed his ability to approach wide sections of the working masses who had had no Party experience; where other propagandists and agitators failed to find the right, comradely approach to them, Comrade Kalinin succeeded. All this is especially important at the present time. Of course, the middle peasantry as a whole, all the best elements among them, are giving us the resolute support that will overcome all difficulties and put down the revolt of the rural kulaks and that insignificant minority of the rural masses who follow them. We know that our main task in a country of small peasants is to ensure an indestructible alliance of the workers and the middle peasants. Our agrarian measures — complete abolition of landed proprietorship and determined assistance to the middle peasants—have already produced results, and in the course of the past year have led to an increase in the number of middle peasants. But in the localities people have frequently been appointed to administrative posts who were not up to the job.

There have been cases of abuses, but we are not to blame for them. We know that we have done everything we could to enlist the intelligentsia, but there were political differences

that kept us apart. We know that the epoch of bourgeois parliamentarism has ended, that the sympathy of the workers of the whole world is with Soviet power, and that the victory of Soviet power is inevitable, no matter how many proletarian leaders the bourgeoisie may kill, as they are doing in Germany. The sum total of their experience will, in the long run, inevitably bring the intelligentsia into our ranks, and we shall acquire the material with which we can govern. We shall see to it that alien elements who have attached themselves to Soviet power are removed—indeed, they are one cause of dissatisfaction which we are not afraid to admit is legitimate. We must pay maximum attention to the fight against this evil. At the Party Congress we decided firmly to make this line of conduct obligatory for all functionaries.

We must say that we see no way of introducing socialist farming other than through a series of comradely agreements with the middle peasants, to whom we must turn more and more often.

We know also that comrades who bore the brunt of the work in the period of the revolution and were completely engrossed in this work, were unable to approach the middle peasants as they should have, they could not avoid making mistakes, each of which was seized upon by our enemies, each of which gave rise to certain doubts and complicated the middle peasant's attitude toward us.

That is why it is very important for this purpose to find a comrade possessing the qualities I have mentioned. We must help him with our organisational experience, so that the middle peasants should see that they have one of their own as the highest functionary in the whole Soviet Republic, so that the decision of our Party calling for a proper approach to the middle peasant and declaring our resolve to examine, study every step we make and test it in the light of the experience we have gained will not remain on paper.

We know that the numbers of our allies are growing, that they will increase many times over in the next few months, but for the time being the burden rests wholly on our country, which is greatly ruined and impoverished. The load is more than the middle peasant can carry. We must go to him and do everything we can, we must make him under-

stand and show him in practice that we are firmly resolved to carry out the decisions of our Party Congress.

That is why the candidacy of a man like Comrade Kalinin ought to have the unanimous support of us all. His candidacy will enable us to organise practically a series of direct contacts between the highest representative of Soviet power and the middle peasants; it will help to bring us closer to them.

This aim cannot be achieved at once, but we have no doubt that the decision we propose to make will be the correct one, though we know that we have little practical experience in this respect. Let the highest representative of the Soviet Republic himself be the first, with our joint assistance, to begin acquiring this experience, gather the full sum of knowledge, and check up; then we can be certain that we shall solve the task facing us, that Russia will become not only the model of a country where the dictatorship of the proletariat has been firmly established and the bourgeoisie ruthlessly suppressed—this has already been done—but also the model of a country where the relations between the urban workers and the middle peasants are satisfactorily arranged on the basis of comradely support and new experience; this is one of the main guarantees of the complete victory of the proletarian revolution.

That is why I take it upon myself to recommend to you this candidacy—the candidacy of Comrade Kalinin.

Brief report published in
the newspaper *Izvestia* No. 70,
April 1, 1919

Published according to
the verbatim report

**SPEECHES
ON GRAMOPHONE RECORDS⁴⁷**

**Recordings made at
the end of March 1919**

**Published according to
the gramophone records**

1

IN MEMORY OF COMRADE YAKOV MIKHAILOVICH
SVERDLOV, CHAIRMAN OF THE ALL-RUSSIA CENTRAL
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

All those who have worked day after day with Comrade Sverdlov, now realise full well that it was his exceptional organising talent which ensured for us that of which we have been so proud, and justly proud. He made it possible for us to carry on united, efficient, organised activities worthy of the organised proletarian masses, without which we could not have achieved success, and which answered fully the requirements of the proletarian revolution. The memory of Comrade Yakov Mikhailovich Sverdlov will serve not only as a symbol of the revolutionary's devotion to his cause, not only as the model of how to combine a practical, sober mind, practical ability, the closest contact with the masses and ability to guide them, but also a pledge that ever-growing masses of proletarians will march forward to the complete victory of the communist revolution.

2

THE THIRD, COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

In March of this year of 1919, an international congress of Communists was held in Moscow. This congress founded the Third, Communist International, an association of the workers of the whole world who are striving to establish Soviet power in all countries.

The First International, founded by Marx, existed from 1864 to 1872. The defeat of the heroic workers of Paris—of the celebrated Paris Commune—marked the end of this International. It is unforgettable, it will remain for ever in the history of the workers' struggle for their emancipation. It laid the foundation of that edifice of the world socialist republic which it is now our good fortune to be building.

The Second International existed from 1889 to 1914, up to the war. This was the period of the most calm and peaceful development of capitalism, a period without great revolutions. During this period the working-class movement gained strength and matured in a number of countries. But the workers' leaders in most of the parties had become accustomed to peaceful conditions and had lost the ability to wage a revolutionary struggle. When, in 1914, there began the war, that drenched the earth with blood for four years, the war between the capitalists over the division of profits, the war for supremacy over small and weak nations, these leaders deserted to the side of their respective governments. They betrayed the workers, they helped to prolong the slaughter, they became enemies of socialism, they went over to the side of the capitalists.

The masses of workers turned their backs on these traitors to socialism. All over the world there was a turn towards the

revolutionary struggle. The war proved that capitalism was doomed. A new system is coming to take its place. The old word socialism had been desecrated by the traitors to socialism.

Today, the workers who have remained loyal to the cause of throwing off the yoke of capital call themselves Communists. All over the world the association of Communists is growing. In a number of countries Soviet power has already triumphed. Soon we shall see the victory of communism throughout the world; we shall see the foundation of the World Federative Republic of Soviets.

Published according to
the gramophone record
verified with the manuscript

3

COMMUNICATION ON THE WIRELESS NEGOTIATIONS
WITH BÉLA KUN

I knew Comrade Béla Kun very well when he was still a prisoner of war in Russia; and he visited me many times to discuss communism and the communist revolution. Therefore, when news of the Hungarian communist revolution was received, and in a communication signed by Comrade Béla Kun at that, we wanted to speak to him and ascertain exactly how the revolution stood. The first communication we received about it gave us some grounds for fearing that, perhaps, the so-called socialists, traitor-socialists, had resorted to some deception, had got round the Communists, the more so that the latter were in prison. And so, the day after the first communication about the Hungarian revolution was received, I sent a wireless message to Budapest, asking Béla Kun to come to the apparatus, and I put a number of questions to him of such a nature as to enable me to make sure that it was really he who was speaking. I asked him what real guarantees there were for the character of the government and for its actual policy. Comrade Béla Kun's reply was quite satisfactory and dispelled all our doubts. It appears that the Left Socialists had visited Béla Kun in prison to consult him about forming a government. And it was only these Left Socialists, who sympathised with the Communists, and also people from the Centre who formed the new government, while the Right Socialists, the traitor-socialists, the irreconcilables and incorrigibles, so to speak, left the Party, and not a single worker followed them. Later communications showed that the policy of the Hungarian Government was most firm and so Communist in trend that

while we began with workers' control of industry and only gradually began to socialise industry, Béla Kun, with his prestige, his conviction that he was backed by vast masses, could at once pass a law which converted all the industrial undertakings in Hungary that were run on capitalist lines into public property. Two days later we became fully convinced that the Hungarian revolution had at once, with extraordinary rapidity, taken the communist road. The bourgeoisie voluntarily surrendered power to the Communists of Hungary. The bourgeoisie demonstrated to the whole world that when a grave crisis supervenes, when the nation is in danger, the bourgeoisie is unable to govern. And there is only one government that is really a popular government, a government that is really beloved of the people—the government of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies.

Long live Soviet power in Hungary!

4

AN APPEAL TO THE RED ARMY

Comrades, Red Army men! The capitalists of Britain, America and France are waging war against Russia. They are taking revenge on the Soviet workers' and peasants' republic for having overthrown the power of the landowners and capitalists and thereby set an example to all the nations of the globe. The capitalists of Britain, France and America are helping with money and munitions the Russian landowners who are bringing troops from Siberia, the Don and North Caucasus against Soviet power for the purpose of restoring the rule of the tsar and the power of the landowners and capitalists. But this will not happen. The Red Army has closed its ranks, has risen up and driven the landowners' troops and whiteguard officers from the Volga, has recaptured Riga and almost the whole of the Ukraine, and is marching towards Odessa and Rostov. A little more effort, a few more months of fighting the enemy, and victory will be ours. The Red Army is strong because it is consciously and unitedly marching into battle for the peasants' land, for the rule of the workers and peasants, for Soviet power.

The Red Army is invincible because it has united millions of working peasants with the workers who have now learned to fight, have acquired comradely discipline, who do not lose heart, who become steeled after slight reverses, and are more and more boldly marching against the enemy, convinced he will soon be defeated.

Comrades, Red Army men! The alliance of the workers and peasants of the Red Army is firm, close and insoluble.

The kulaks, the very rich peasants, are trying to foment revolts against Soviet power, but they constitute an insignificant minority. They rarely succeed in fooling the peasants, and then not for long. The peasants know that only in alliance with the workers can they vanquish the landowners. Sometimes, in the rural districts people call themselves Communists who are actually the worst enemies of the working people, bullies who hang on to the authorities in pursuit of their own selfish aims, and who resort to deception, commit acts of injustice and wrong the middle peasant. The workers' and peasants' government has firmly decided to fight against these people and clear them out of the countryside. The middle peasants are not enemies but friends of the workers, friends of Soviet power. The class-conscious workers and genuine Soviet people treat the middle peasants as comrades. The middle peasants do not exploit the labour of others, they do not grow rich at other people's expense, as the kulaks do; the middle peasants work themselves, they live by their own labour. The Soviet government will crush the kulaks, will comb out of the villages those who treat the middle peasants unjustly and, come what may, will pursue the policy of alliance between the workers and all the working peasants—both poor and middle peasants.

This alliance is growing all over the world. The revolution is drawing nigh, it is everywhere maturing. A few days ago it was victorious in Hungary. In Hungary, Soviet power, workers' government, has been established. This is what all nations will inevitably do.

Comrades, Red Army men! Be staunch, firm and united. March boldly forward against the enemy. Victory will be ours. The power of the landowners and the capitalists, broken in Russia, will be defeated throughout the world.

March 29

5

THE MIDDLE PEASANTS

The most important question now confronting the Communist Party, the question on which most attention was concentrated at the last Party Congress, is that of the middle peasants.

Naturally, the first question usually asked is, what is a middle peasant?

Naturally, Party comrades have often related how they have been asked this question in the villages. The middle peasant, we say in reply, is a peasant who does not exploit the labour of others, who does not live on the labour of others, who does not take the fruits of other people's labour in any shape or form, but works himself, and lives by his own labour.

Under capitalism there were fewer peasants of this type than there are now, because the majority of the peasants were in the ranks of the impoverished, and only an insignificant minority, then, as now, were in the ranks of the kulaks, the exploiters, the rich peasants.

The middle peasants have been increasing in number since the private ownership of land was abolished, and the Soviet government has firmly resolved at all costs to establish relations of complete peace and harmony with them. It goes without saying that the middle peasant cannot immediately accept socialism, because he clings firmly to what he is accustomed to, he is cautious about all innovations, subjects what he is offered to a factual, practical test and does not decide to change his way of life until he is convinced that the change is necessary.

It is precisely for this reason that we must know, remember and put into practice the rule that when Communist workers go into rural districts they must try to establish comradely relations with the middle peasants, it is their duty to establish these comradely relations with them; they must remember that working peasants who do not exploit the labour of others are the comrades of the urban workers and that we can and must establish with them a voluntary alliance inspired by sincerity and confidence. Every measure proposed by the communist government must be regarded merely as advice, as a suggestion to the middle peasants, as an invitation to them to accept the new order.

Only by co-operation in the work of testing these measures in practice, finding out in what way they are mistaken, eliminating possible errors and achieving agreement with the middle peasant—only by such co-operation can the alliance between the workers and the peasants be ensured. This alliance is the main strength and the bulwark of Soviet power; this alliance is a pledge that socialist transformation will be successful, victory over capital will be achieved and exploitation in all its forms will be abolished.

6

WHAT IS SOVIET POWER?

What is Soviet power? What is the essence of this new power, which people in most countries still will not, or cannot, understand? The nature of this power, which is attracting larger and larger numbers of workers in every country, is the following: in the past the country was, in one way or another, governed by the rich, or by the capitalists, but now, for the first time, the country is being governed by the classes, and moreover, by the masses of those classes, which capitalism formerly oppressed. Even in the most democratic and freest republics, as long as capital rules and the land remains private property, the government will always be in the hands of a small minority, nine-tenths of which consist of capitalists, or rich men.

In this country, in Russia, for the first time in the world history, the government of the country is so organised that only the workers and the working peasants, to the exclusion of the exploiters, constitute those mass organisations known as Soviets, and these Soviets wield all state power. That is why, in spite of the slander that the representatives of the bourgeoisie in all countries spread about Russia, the word "Soviet" has now become not only intelligible but popular all over the world, has become the favourite word of the workers, and of all working people. And that is why, notwithstanding all the persecution to which the adherents of communism in the different countries are subjected, Soviet power must necessarily, inevitably, and in the not distant future, triumph all over the world.

We know very well that there are still many defects in the organisation of Soviet power in this country. Soviet

power is not a miracle-working talisman. It does not, overnight, heal all the evils of the past—illiteracy, lack of culture, the consequences of a barbarous war, the aftermath of predatory capitalism. But it does pave the way to socialism. It gives those who were formerly oppressed the chance to straighten their backs and to an ever-increasing degree to take the whole government of the country, the whole administration of the economy, the whole management of production, into their own hands.

Soviet power is the road to socialism that was discovered by the masses of the working people, and that is why it is the true road, that is why it is invincible.

7

HOW THE WORKING PEOPLE CAN BE SAVED
FROM THE OPPRESSION OF THE LANDOWNERS
AND CAPITALISTS FOR EVER

The enemies of the working people, the landowners and capitalists say that the workers and peasants cannot live without them. "If it were not for us," they say, "there would be nobody to maintain order, to give out work, and to compel people to work. If it were not for us everything would collapse, and the state would fall to pieces. We have been driven away, but chaos will bring us back again." But this sort of talk by the landowners and capitalists will not confuse, intimidate, or deceive the workers and peasants. An army needs the strictest discipline; nevertheless the class-conscious workers succeeded in uniting the peasants, succeeded in taking the old tsarist officers into their service, succeeded in building a victorious army.

The Red Army established unprecedentedly firm discipline—not by means of the lash, but based on the intelligence, loyalty and devotion of the workers and peasants themselves.

And so, to save the working people from the yoke of the landowners and capitalists for ever, to save them from the restoration of their power, it is necessary to build up a great Red Army of Labour. That army will be invincible if it is cemented by labour discipline. The workers and peasants must and will prove that they can properly distribute labour, establish devoted discipline and ensure loyalty in working for the common good, and can do it themselves,

without the landowners and in spite of them, without the capitalists and in spite of them.

Labour discipline, enthusiasm for work, readiness for self-sacrifice, close alliance between the peasants and the workers—this is what will save the working people from the oppression of the landowners and capitalists for ever.

8

ANTI-JEWISH POGROMS

Anti-Semitism means spreading enmity towards the Jews. When the accursed tsarist monarchy was living its last days it tried to incite ignorant workers and peasants against the Jews. The tsarist police, in alliance with the landowners and the capitalists, organised pogroms against the Jews. The landowners and capitalists tried to divert the hatred of the workers and peasants who were tortured by want against the Jews. In other countries, too, we often see the capitalists fomenting hatred against the Jews in order to blind the workers, to divert their attention from the real enemy of the working people, capital. Hatred towards the Jews persists only in those countries where slavery to the landowners and capitalists has created abysmal ignorance among the workers and peasants. Only the most ignorant and downtrodden people can believe the lies and slander that are spread about the Jews. This is a survival of ancient feudal times, when the priests burned heretics at the stake, when the peasants lived in slavery, and when the people were crushed and inarticulate. This ancient, feudal ignorance is passing away; the eyes of the people are being opened.

It is not the Jews who are the enemies of the working people. The enemies of the workers are the capitalists of all countries. Among the Jews there are working people, and they form the majority. They are our brothers, who, like us, are oppressed by capital; they are our comrades in the struggle for socialism. Among the Jews there are kulaks, exploiters and capitalists, just as there are among the Russians, and among people of all nations. The capitalists strive to sow and foment hatred between workers of different faiths, differ-

ent nations and different races. Those who do not work are kept in power by the power and strength of capital. Rich Jews, like rich Russians, and the rich in all countries, are in alliance to oppress, crush, rob and disunite the workers.

Shame on accursed tsarism which tortured and persecuted the Jews. Shame on those who foment hatred towards the Jews, who foment hatred towards other nations.

Long live the fraternal trust and fighting alliance of the workers of all nations in the struggle to overthrow capital.

**TELEPHONE MESSAGE
TO THE ALL-RUSSIA EXTRAORDINARY COMMISSION
APRIL 1, 1919**

The All-Russia Extraordinary Commission reports that information has been received from Petrograd to the effect that agents of Kolchak, Denikin and the Allies made an attempt to blow up the Petrograd water main. In the cellars, explosives and an infernal machine were found, which a special unit took away to destroy, but as a result of a premature explosion the commander of the unit was killed and ten Red Army men were wounded.

In some places attempts are being made to blow up bridges and to dislocate railway traffic.

Attempts are being made to destroy the permanent way and cut off Red Moscow and Petrograd from food supplies.

The Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks are taking an active part in fomenting strikes and in calling for the overthrow of Soviet power.

In view of this information, the Council of Defence orders you to take the most urgent measures to suppress every attempt to cause explosions, to wreck railways and to foment strikes.

The Council of Defence orders you to call upon all Extraordinary Commission workers to be vigilant, and also orders you to inform the Council of Defence of all measures you take.

V. Ulyanov (Lenin),
Chairman of the Council of Defence

**EXTRAORDINARY PLENARY MEETING
OF THE MOSCOW
SOVIET OF WORKERS' AND RED ARMY DEPUTIES
APRIL 3, 1919**

1

**REPORT ON THE DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN SITUATION
OF THE SOVIET REPUBLIC**

Comrades, I must commence my report on the domestic and foreign situation of the Soviet Republic by stating that in the coming few months, with the approach of spring, we shall again be faced with an extremely grave situation. I think that the conditions both of the Civil War and of the war against the Entente—I will deal with them when I speak of the international situation—enable us to say, even if we are very cautious, that the half-year, the middle of which we have now reached, will be the last difficult half-year; the French and British capitalists will not be strong enough to launch another attack similar to the one they are now developing in full. On the other hand, all our Red Army's achievements in the Ukraine and the Don, which we are able to consolidate, will greatly alleviate our internal situation, will provide grain and coal, food and fuel. For the time being, however, while the struggle is still going on and we are encountering enormous difficulties in collecting grain in the Ukraine with the roads now impassable owing to the spring thaw, the situation is extremely grave.

We have said more than once that the whole strength of Soviet power rests on the confidence and class-consciousness of the workers. We have more than once demonstrated that numerous as may be the enemies that surround us now, and the spies that the Entente sends into this country and who are assisted by people who are actually helping the

whiteguards, probably without realising it, we have never for a moment shut our eyes to the fact that every word uttered here will be misinterpreted, that the agents of the whiteguards will carefully take note of our admissions. But we say: let them! We shall benefit far more from the straightforward and candid truth, because we are sure that although this truth is harsh, nevertheless, if it is clearly heard, every class-conscious worker, every working peasant, will draw the only correct conclusion that can be drawn from it.

In the long run, they will draw from it the only possible conclusion that our cause is close to victory all over the world, and desperately hard as the conditions of the masses of the working people may be, weary, starving and exhausted as they are by four years of imperialist war and another two years of the most frightful Civil War—grave and acute though the situation may be at the present time, we have the most serious chances of gaining victory not only in Russia, but all over the world. That is why, although the next four or five months will be very severe, we shall once again succeed in overcoming our difficulties, and thus prove to our enemies, prove to the combined capitalists of the whole world, that their attack on Russia must fail.

At the present moment they are undoubtedly operating according to a preconceived plan, making attempts in the West and the East to crush us by force of arms so as to save Krasnov's doomed gangs. Yesterday we received news of the capture of Mariupol. Thus, Rostov is caught in a half-circle. In short, the Entente countries are exerting all their efforts to rescue Krasnov and to strike us a severe blow this very spring. They are undoubtedly operating in agreement with Hindenburg. A comrade from Latvia told us about the conditions under which our Lettish comrades are living. The greater part of the country has suffered misfortunes such as Moscow workers cannot conceive—the misfortunes of invasion and the repeated devastation of the countryside by hordes of moving troops. The Germans are now marching on Dvinsk in order to cut off Riga. In the North they are being assisted by the Estonian whiteguards using money sent by Britain, and with the aid of volunteers sent by the Swedes and Danes, who are entirely in the pay of the multimillion-

aires of Britain, France and America. They are operating according to a common plan which is quite clear to us; they are taking advantage of the fact that by their bloody suppressions in Germany they have weakened the movement of the Spartacists and revolutionaries. And although they realise that they are at their last gasp, they, nevertheless, find the situation sufficiently opportune to place some troops at Hindenburg's disposal, to step up the attack on tormented and tortured Latvia from the west, and to threaten us. On the other hand, Kolchak has achieved a series of victories in the east, and is thus paving the way for the last and most decisive onslaught of the Entente countries.

And as has always been the case, they are not confining themselves to an attack from without, they are operating inside this country by means of plots, rebellions, attempts at bomb-throwing and blowing up the water main in Petrograd, which you read about in the newspapers, attempts to dismantle railway lines, such as those made not far from Samara, which is now the main line that supplies us with grain from the East. Part of this grain we lost; it was captured by Kolchak. Attempts were made to damage the permanent way of the Kursk-Kharkov Railway, on which we were beginning to transport the coal the Red Army had recaptured in the Donets Basin. When all this is taken together, it becomes clear that the Entente countries, the French imperialists and multimillionaires, are making their last attempt to crush Soviet power by force of arms.

And the Mensheviks and the Right and Left Socialist-Revolutionaries still fail to realise that the struggle is drawing to a close and that we are engaged in a most desperate and relentless war; they continue to advocate either strikes or the cessation of the Civil War, which in any case is helping the whiteguards. I shall speak about them later on; at present I merely want to show that the situation is really grave.

This spring all the forces of the international capitalists want to fight the last battle with us. Fortunately, they are the forces of a decrepit, dying, hopelessly sick old man—international capitalism. But be that as it may, very big military forces have been mustered against us; Kolchak, in particular, is now bringing up all his reserves against us, his

gangs of volunteer whiteguards are of imposing dimensions, and he is receiving the assistance of Britain and America in the form of vast quantities of arms and munitions. That is why the present situation demands a clear realisation of the difficulties that face the Soviet Republic.

We are convinced that the masses of the working people understand what the war is about. They know that the next few months will decide the fate of our revolution, and to a large extent of the world revolution. They understand that the attempts of the capitalists to crush Soviet Russia have become so fierce, that they are attacking us so furiously, because they realise that in their own countries they are faced by the same enemy—the Bolshevik movement. The growth of the movement in those countries is equally rapid and irresistible.

Our difficulties in food and transport make our position particularly grave and compel us again and again to appeal for the aid of all class-conscious workers. For four years the transport system was gradually ruined by the imperialist war, and in Russia, a backward country, traces of this have not yet been removed, and it will take many months, if not years, of persevering effort to remove them. But it is impossible to work without fuel. Only lately have we begun to receive coal from the Donets Basin. You know that the British have robbed us of our Baku oil supplies. They have captured many of the ships in the Caspian Sea, they have occupied Grozny and are preventing us from using the oil. Neither industry nor the railways can work without fuel. We must exert our efforts to the utmost.

Once again we say to all our comrades that we must enlist larger forces for work on food supplies and transport. The transport situation is such that in Eastern Russia, beyond the Volga, we have accumulated millions of poods of grain—10 to 20 million poods have already been acquired and are in store—but cannot transport it. We lost part of this grain as Kolchak's troops advanced, captured Ufa and compelled our forces to retreat. This loss is a very severe one, and we feel it very much. Transport work calls for the utmost exertion of effort; at every meeting the workers should ask themselves how they can help to improve transport. Cannot women do the work here in place of the men, and the men be

sent either to the repair shops or to help the railwaymen? The workers are the best judges of what should be done, because they know which men to put on which job. Practical people know best, and they must devise new ways and means of assisting. We hope, we are convinced, that our Commissariat of Railways, in conjunction with the Commissariat of Food, have already achieved a certain degree of success. No matter what lies our enemies may spread, this goods transport month during which passenger traffic is suspended has already brought about an improvement; but ten times more effort must be exerted to achieve greater success. Some figures were published in yesterday's issue of *Izvestia*, the most important of which I will here quote. At the beginning of March, an average of 118 carloads of food of which 25 consisted of grain, were arriving in Moscow every day. By the end of March, the average daily arrivals had increased to 209 carloads of food, of which 47 contained grain. This is an almost twofold increase. It proves that the stern measure of suspending passenger traffic is correct and justified, and shows that we have assisted the starving population of Moscow, Petrograd and of the whole industrial region. But this is by no means all that can be done. And later, when the roads become quite impassable, we shall be faced with a much more difficult and hungry time. That is why we say that in this field the most unrelaxing, energetic efforts must be made. Mainly, we must rely upon the masses of the workers and not count upon the intellectuals who, although they have come to work for us, have a large number of useless people among them.

We must also reckon with the situation in the Ukraine. During the year when the entire Ukraine was occupied by the Germans, and the whole of the Don region was in a sorry state, we suffered a great deal. Now, however, our position is improving. In the Ukraine there are 258 million poods of grain, of which 100 million have already been earmarked for delivery. But the whole trouble is that the Ukrainian peasants have been frightfully intimidated by the Germans and by German looting. I have heard that the peasants there have been so intimidated by the Germans that although they know what the position of the Soviet power is here, they still hesitate to seize the landed estates.

Meanwhile, the time is approaching for spring field work; but the Ukrainian peasants have suffered the horrors of German looting to such an extent that to this day they are extremely irresolute. I must say that guerrilla warfare has been going on there all the time. In the South it is still going on. There are no regular troops there, owing to which complete victory has not yet been won. We have moved our regular troops in, but this is not enough. We must greatly intensify our efforts, and that is why I insist that at every meeting of workers the question of food supplies and the question of transport definitely must be raised. In the very near future we have to decide the question of how to relieve the situation, and how to utilise what is now available.

We must bear firmly in mind that only with the aid of the forces of the working class can we stand firmly on our feet, and achieve our brilliant victories; and that is why we must send the best forces of the proletariat to the front. We must send leading functionaries to the front and if some office suffers as a result of it, we shall, of course, sustain some loss, but it will not be fatal. If there is a shortage of workers in the army, however, that will certainly be fatal. A defect in our army up to now has been that it lacks cohesion and is not sufficiently organised; all help in this sphere must come from the workers, and on them we must place all our hopes. Only those workers who have gone through the whole struggle, who can relate all their experiences and all they have suffered can influence the army and turn the peasants into the politically-conscious fighters that we need.

That is why we have come here again and decided to call you all together to inform you of the serious state of our transport system, due to the general grave position that we are in. We stress the importance of our holding out for another three or four months, and that only then will complete victory be ours. But for this we need forces. Where are these forces to be found? Is it not clear that only the workers, those who have borne the whole burden of the chaos, bore the whole burden when the struggle changed to whiteguard invasions and thereby acquired great experience—is it not clear that only these workers, only these vanguard contingents, can help us? We know perfectly well that they are terribly exhausted, that they are worn out by the superhuman efforts

they are called upon to make. We know all this, but nevertheless, we now say to you here that we must strain every nerve, we must concentrate our minds on rallying all forces to achieve a brilliant victory for the revolution. We are now entering the most difficult, the most trying period, and we must act like revolutionaries. We must recruit our forces from the masses of the working people.

Yesterday a meeting was held of the influential leaders of the trade union movement—both the Moscow and the national leaders. And at this meeting everybody agreed that it is necessary, at the present moment, to enlist for this work the middle stratum of workers, whom everybody has up to now regarded as being incapable of this type of work. Now, however, it is perfectly clear that we must send this middle stratum to relieve our exhausted functionaries. Before doing so, however, those who have been engaged in this work up to now must instruct the newcomers. We must husband our forces, and for a time we must send the middle stratum of workers to take the place of our leading functionaries. We must send tens of thousands of such workers into the field. We must not be afraid that they will not do the work as well as the experienced functionaries did. If we put them into responsible positions, then the mistakes that they may make at first will not have serious consequences. The important thing for us is to put them in the foremost responsible posts. There they will be able to exert an effort and develop their activities, because they will be able to operate confidently, they will know that they are backed by experienced leading workers who have already had a year's experience of work in Russia. They will know that at critical moments these more experienced comrades will come to their aid and ease their task. This new stratum of workers will be able to do their work well if the advanced workers promote them to leading positions. We can do this without causing any damage, because this large stratum has a proletarian instinct, a proletarian understanding and sense of duty. We may rely upon it, and we may say that it will help us in a time of difficulty. It is a specific feature of Russia that in every critical situation she has always been able to find masses of people who could be moved forward, who were a reserve in which she could find new forces when the

old forces began to grow thin. Yes, the advanced workers are overtired, and the next contingent will not do the work so well; but that is not disastrous, we shall not suffer from it, we shall not ruin our cause if we send these new forces into the field, guide them, and not allow our cause to die.

Under these circumstances I must speak about the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks. Lately, the Soviet government has begun to close down their newspapers and to arrest them. Some worker comrades, seeing this, say: "So those Bolsheviks"—I among that number—"who induced us to make certain concessions to the petty-bourgeois democrats were wrong. What was the use of making these concessions if we must now close down their newspapers and arrest them? Is this consistency?"

My answer is this. In a country like Russia, where agriculture is concentrated in the hands of the petty-bourgeois elements, we cannot hold out for long without the support of this petty-bourgeois stratum. At the present time, this stratum is marching towards the goal not by a straight road, but in zigzags. If I am pursuing an enemy who is retreating not by a straight road but in zigzags, then I, too, must proceed in zigzags in order to overtake him. To speak in the language of politics, the petty-bourgeois masses stand between labour and capital, and these masses must be beaten a hundred times to make them understand that the alternative is either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the working class. Those who are aware of this, understand the present situation. The workers understand it. Experience and a whole series of observations have taught them that only one or the other of these two systems of government is possible—either the absolute power of the working class, or the absolute power of the bourgeoisie—there can be no middle, or third, course. The working class learned this long ago from its strike and revolutionary struggle. The petty bourgeoisie cannot learn this at once; hundreds of everyday facts have failed to teach and accustom the petty bourgeoisie to this idea, and they continue to dream of uniting with the big bourgeoisie; for they cannot understand that either the dictatorship of the proletariat or the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is inevitable.

Experience of Kolchak taught the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks that it was no accident that in the midst of a furious and desperate struggle conducted with foreign assistance, democracy had nothing to give. Two forces are operating upon them—and there are no other forces but these—either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, or the power and complete dictatorship of the working class; no middle course was ever of any use, nothing came of it anywhere. Nor did anything come of the Constituent Assembly. This the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks and the petty bourgeoisie learned from their own experience.

When the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks said: "We shall abandon Kolchak and all those who support him and the intervention of the Entente," it was not only hypocrisy. It was not only a political ruse, although some of these people did think they would fool the Bolsheviks and get an opportunity to play the old game again. We saw through this ruse and, of course, took measures against it. But when the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries said this, it was not only hypocrisy and cunning; many of them did it *in good faith*. Among them there is not only the group of writers, but also a petty-bourgeois stratum of technicians, engineers, and so forth. When the Mensheviks announced that they were opposed to the intervention of the Entente, we invited them to work with us, and they willingly accepted our invitation. But now we are quite right in persecuting them, persecuting the petty-bourgeois stratum, because this stratum is extremely obtuse. This was revealed in the Kerensky period and also by their present conduct. When they came to work for us they said they had abandoned politics, and would work willingly. We told them in reply that we needed Menshevik officials, because they were not embezzlers of state funds, and not Black Hundreds who worm their way into our ranks, call themselves Communists and do us mischief. If these people believe in the Constituent Assembly we tell them to go on believing, not only in the Constituent Assembly, but even in God, but do their work properly and keep out of politics. An increasing number of them realise that they have disgraced themselves in politics. They howled that Soviet power was a monstrous invention, possible only in barbarous Russia. They said that the dissolution of the

Constituent Assembly was an act by barbarians whom tsarism had produced. And this was repeated in Europe. Now news comes from Europe that Soviet power is coming to take the place of bourgeois Constituent Assemblies all over the world. These are lessons that are being taught to all intellectuals who come to work for us. We now have twice as many civil servants working for us as we had six months ago. We have gained by accepting these civil servants who do their work better than Black Hundreds. When we invited them to come to work for us they said they were afraid of Kolchak, they preferred us, but would not help us, they said they would talk like pure parliamentarians, just as if they were sitting in a Constituent Assembly; and we shouldn't dare to touch them, because they were democrats. But we say to these groups who talk about the Constituent Assembly that if they talk like that much longer we shall pack them off to Kolchak and to Georgia. (*Applause.*) Polemics are started, and the opposition of a legal group takes shape. We shall allow no opposition. The imperialists of the whole world have got us by the throat, they are trying to defeat us by all the force of an armed attack and we must fight a life-and-death struggle. If you have come here to help us, then do so, but if you are going to publish newspapers and incite the workers to strike, and these strikes cause the death of our Red Army men at the front, and every day of a strike causes tens of thousands of our factory workers to suffer privations, pangs of hunger—the pangs which are causing us so much concern—then you may be right from the Constituent Assembly point of view, but from the standpoint of our struggle and the responsibility we bear, you are wrong, you cannot help us, so get out, go to Georgia, go to Kolchak, or else you will go to prison. And that is what we shall do with them.

Comrades, I hope we shall all unanimously adopt the resolution to be submitted to you at the end of the meeting. In it we have endeavoured to formulate the necessary instructions, the reasons for which I have given in my report. I should now like to deal with two questions—the position of the middle peasants, and the international situation, which is extremely important.

We discussed the question of the middle peasants at our Party Congress and decided on the line our Party should

pursue towards them. Our Party elected to a responsible post, the post of Chairman of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, a post which is all the more responsible for the fact that until recently it was occupied by that exceptionally talented organiser Comrade Sverdlov, for this post our Party chose Comrade Kalinin, a St. Petersburg worker who still has connections with the rural districts. There is a report in the newspapers today that a certain Comrade Kalinin was assassinated by the Socialist-Revolutionaries, but it is not this Kalinin. This shows what methods the Socialist-Revolutionaries resort to. Comrade Mikhail Ivanovich Kalinin is a middle peasant from Tver Gubernia, which he visits every year. The middle peasants constitute the largest stratum of the population, and their numbers have increased since our revolution owing to the fact that we abolished the landed estates. The peasantry benefited by our revolution because they seized all the landed estates and, as a consequence, the number of middle peasants greatly increased. If there is discontent among the middle peasants, we say that it is caused from above, and we must ascertain to what extent it is legitimate, considering our lack of forces. You, here in the capital, know how difficult it is to combat bureaucracy and red tape. We are obliged to employ the old civil servants because no other are available. They must be re-educated, taught; but this takes time. We may appoint new workers to responsible posts in the food supply organisations, but there is still an exceedingly large number of old civil servants in the State Control Commission, and we suffer from red tape and bureaucracy. We are trying to appoint new workers to take part in control in the Commissariat of Railways and to work side by side with the experts. This is the way we are combating bureaucracy and red tape. What effort it costs, even here in Moscow! And what is going on in the rural districts? There, people who call themselves members of the Party are often scoundrels, whose lawlessness is most brazen. And how often we have to contend with inexperienced people, who confuse the kulaks with the middle peasants! A kulak is one who lives on the labour of others, who robs others of the fruits of their labour, and takes advantage of their poverty. The middle peasants do not exploit others and are not exploited themselves; they earn their

livelihood on their small farms by their own labour. Not a single socialist in the world ever proposed that the small farmer should be deprived of his property. The small farmer will exist for many years to come. No decrees will have any effect here; we must wait until the peasants have learned to be guided by experience. When they see that collective farming is far better, they will come over to our side. We must win their confidence. Here we must wage a struggle against abuses. We can fight only with the aid of the urban workers, because they have close connections with the peasants, and they can supply us with hundreds of thousands of functionaries. We know perfectly well that no appointments of comrades to high posts, no circulars, and no decrees will be of any avail, and that the workers of every group, of every circle, must set to work themselves—they have special connections with the rural districts.

I said that the first rule for the workers must be—exert all efforts to help to prosecute the war. The second rule should be—help the middle peasants by keeping in contact with them, so as not to allow a single serious enemy attack in the rural districts to go unpunished. We must point out that the urban workers are bringing assistance to the middle peasants, their comrades, because the middle peasants are also workers, but workers who have been reared under other conditions, who live isolated from each other in rural ignorance from which it is more difficult for them to extricate themselves. And we must know that the perseverance of our comrades will establish contacts with the middle peasants. An infinitesimal number of peasants will become kulaks, will foment rebellion—that we know. That being the case, how can we help, how can we win the confidence of the middle peasants, how can we help them to combat all sorts of abuses? If we have done little in this field it is not our fault, for we had to fight the bourgeoisie. This has to be realised. Every worker must put the question this way—we, the workers as a whole, have contacts with the middle peasants, and we will utilise these contacts, and see to it that every middle peasant learns of our help not only from the appointment of Comrade Kalinin, but also from the fact that he is obtaining some real assistance, if only slight, if only in the form of slight but comradely advice. The peasants will now

appreciate such assistance more than anything else. They must be made to understand why the difficulties of our position prevent us from giving them the assistance they need, assistance in the form of urban culture. The peasants need city-made goods, urban culture, and we must give them these things. Only when the proletariat gives the peasants this form of assistance will they realise that the help of the workers is different from that of the exploiters. To help the peasants to rise to the urban level—this is the task that every worker who has connections with the rural districts must set himself. The urban workers must say to themselves that now, in the spring, when the food situation has become particularly acute, they must go to the peasants' assistance. And if everybody does even a tiny share of this work, we shall see that our edifice has not merely a façade, and that our cause of safeguarding Soviet power will be achieved; for the peasants say: "Long live Soviet power, long live the Bolsheviks, but down with the communia!" They curse the "communia" that is being organised in a stupid way and forced upon them. They are suspicious of everything that is forced upon them, and quite rightly so. We must go to the middle peasants, we must help them, teach them, but only in the field of science and socialism. In the field of agriculture we must learn from them. There you have the task that confronts us directly.

We now come to the international situation. I say that the imperialists of Britain, France and America are making their last attempt to bring us to our knees, but they will fail. Difficult as the situation is, we can say with confidence that we shall defeat international imperialism. We shall defeat the multimillionaires of the whole world. There are two reasons why we shall beat them. First, because they are wild beasts who are so absorbed in fighting among themselves, that they continue to bite each other and fail to see that they are on the brink of a precipice; secondly, because Soviet power is growing uninterruptedly all over the world. Not a day passes but what we read about this in the newspapers. Today we read a message wirelessly from an American press office in Lyons to the effect that the Committee of Ten has now been reduced, and that there are now only four—Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Orlando. These are

the leaders of four nations, but even they cannot reach an agreement. Britain and America do not want France to have the coal profits. They are wild beasts who have plundered the whole world and are now quarrelling over the prey. These four men have shut themselves up in close conclave so that, God forbid, rumours may not get about—they are all such great democrats—but they themselves set rumours afloat by sending out wireless messages about not agreeing to give up the coal profits. A French comrade who saw the French prisoners of war told me that these prisoners say: "We were told that we must go to Russia to fight the Germans because the Germans had destroyed our country. But now there is an armistice with Germany; whom are we going to fight?" They were not told a word about that. The number of people who are asking themselves this question is day by day growing into millions and millions. These people have experienced the horrors of the imperialist war, and they say: "What are we going to fight for?" In the past, the Bolsheviks taught them what they were fighting for in underground leaflets; but now the imperialists send out wireless messages saying that Britain does not agree to allow France to have the coal profits. Thus, as a French journalist expressed it, they are rushing from room to room in a vain effort to solve the problem. They are trying to decide who should get most, and they have been fighting each other for five months. These wild beasts have lost their self-control, and will go on fighting until nothing is left of them except their tails. And we say that our international position, which at first was so precarious that they could have crushed us in several weeks, is now, when they are quarrelling over the loot and are beginning to fly at each others' throats—now our position is much better. They promised the soldiers that if they conquered Germany they would receive untold benefits. They are arguing whether to compel Germany to pay sixty or eighty milliard. This is an extremely important question of principle, an extremely interesting one, especially if the workers or peasants are told about it. But if they go on arguing for long they will not get even one milliard. This is what is most interesting!

That is why we say, without exaggerating in the least, not even as socialists, but simply and soberly weighing up the

forces that are mustered against us, that the position of the Soviet Republic is improving day by day and hour by hour. Our enemies cannot agree among themselves. Five months have passed since they won their victory, but they have not concluded peace. Recently, the French Chamber again voted hundreds of millions for war preparations. They are digging their own grave, and there are people over there who will lower them into this grave and pile plenty of earth over them. (*Applause.*) This is because the Soviet movement is growing in all countries. And the Hungarian revolution has shown that when we say that we are fighting not only for ourselves, but for Soviet power all over the world, that blood of the Red Army men is being shed not only for the sake of our starving comrades, but for the victory of Soviet power all over the world—the example of Hungary has shown that this is not merely prophecies and promises, but the most actual and immediate reality.

In Hungary the revolution was most unusual in form. The Hungarian Kerensky, who over there is called Károlyi, voluntarily resigned, and the Hungarian compromisers—the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries—realised that they must go to the prison where our Hungarian comrade Béla Kun, one of the best of the Hungarian Communists, was confined. They went to him and said: "You must take power!" (*Applause.*) The bourgeois government resigned. The bourgeois socialists, the Hungarian Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, merged with the Hungarian Bolshevik Party and formed a united party and a united government. Comrade Béla Kun, our comrade, and a Communist who had trodden the whole practical path of Bolshevism in Russia, said to me when I spoke to him by wireless: "I have not got a majority in the government, but I shall win because the masses are behind me, and we are convening a congress of Soviets." This is a revolution of world-historical importance.

Up to now all the European workers have been told lies about Soviet Russia. They have been told that there is no government but sheer anarchy in Russia. The Bolsheviks are just a crowd of quarrelsome people. Recently, the French Minister, Pichon, said about Soviet Russia, "It is anarchy, they are violators, usurpers!" "Look at Russia," said the German Mensheviks to their workers. "War, famine and ruin!

Is this the sort of socialism you want?" And in this way they have been intimidating the workers. But Hungary was an example of a revolution born in a different way. Hungary will undoubtedly have to go through a severe struggle against the bourgeoisie—that is inevitable. But the fact is that when those beasts, the British and French imperialists, foresaw the possibility of revolution in Hungary they wanted to crush it, to prevent its birth. The difficulty of our position was that we had to give birth to Soviet power in opposition to patriotism. We had to break down this patriotism and conclude the Brest peace. This was a most desperate, furious and sanguinary operation. The bourgeoisie in the neighbouring countries realised who would have to govern. Who, if not the Soviet? It was like the old days when kings, kinglets and princes saw that their power was waning and they said, "We must have a constitution; let the bourgeoisie come and govern!" And if the king was feeble, he was given a pension, or a sinecure. What the kings or kinglets experienced fifty or sixty years ago, the world bourgeoisie is now experiencing. When the British and French imperialists submitted unprecedented demands to the Hungarian capitalists, the latter said, "We cannot fight. The people will not follow us; but we are Hungarian patriots and we want to resist. What kind of government should we have? A Soviet government." The Hungarian bourgeoisie admitted to the world that it had resigned voluntarily and that the only power in the world capable of guiding the nation in a moment of crisis was Soviet power. (*Applause.*) That is why the Hungarian revolution, owing to its having been born in a totally different way from ours, will reveal to the whole world that which was concealed in Russia—i.e., that Bolshevism is bound up with a new, proletarian, workers' democracy, that is taking the place of the old parliament. Time was when the workers were deceived and enslaved by capital. Today, world Soviet power is coming into being to take the place of the old bourgeois parliament; and this Soviet power has won the sympathies of all workers because it is the power of the working people, the power of millions who rule and govern themselves. Perhaps they govern badly, as we do in Russia, but our conditions are exceedingly difficult. In a country where the bourgeoisie will not offer such furious re-

sistance, the tasks of the Soviet government will be easier; it will be able to operate without the violence, without the bloodshed that was forced upon us by the Kerenskys and the imperialists. We shall reach our goal even by this, more difficult, road. Russia may have to make greater sacrifices than other countries; this is not surprising considering the chaos that we inherited. Other countries will travel by a different, more humane road, but at the end of it lies the same Soviet power. That is why the example of Hungary is of decisive importance.

People learn from experience. It is impossible to prove merely by words that Soviet power is just. The example of Russia alone was not sufficiently intelligible to the workers of all countries. They knew that there was a Soviet there, they were all in favour of the Soviet, but they were daunted by the horrors of the sanguinary struggle. The example of Hungary will be decisive for the proletarian masses, for the European proletariat and working peasants. In a moment of difficulty there is no one to rule the country but the Soviet government.

We remember what old people say, "The children have grown up, they have made their way in the world, now we can die." But we do not intend to die. We are marching to victory. But when we see children like Hungary, where Soviet power already exists, we say that we have done our work not only on a Russian, but also on an international scale; that we shall surmount all our desperate difficulties and win full victory, so that we shall live to see the day when the world Soviet republic will be added to the Russian and the Hungarian Soviet Republics. (*Applause.*)

2

RESOLUTION ON THE REPORT
ON THE DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN SITUATION
OF THE SOVIET REPUBLIC

The Soviet Republic, in the harsh but glorious struggle it is waging at the head of all peoples, is entering the most difficult period of its existence. The next few months will be months of crisis. The Entente is making its last, desperate effort to crush us by force of arms. The food situation is becoming extremely acute. The transport system is in a serious state.

Only the greatest effort can save us. Victory is nevertheless fully possible. The revolution in Hungary provides conclusive proof of the rapid growth of the Soviet movement in Europe, and of its impending victory. We have more allies in all countries than we ourselves imagine. To achieve the final victory we must hold on for another four or five months, which, perhaps, will be the bitterest and most dangerous. And in days like these, reckless men and adventurers who call themselves Mensheviks and Left and Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, while paying lip-service to Soviet power and protesting against the armed intervention of the Entente, are fomenting strikes or agitating for concessions to freedom to trade or for the cessation of the Civil War, forgetting that we have offered peace to all, and that our war is a just, legitimate and unavoidable war of defence. Obviously, by this sort of agitation they give most active and effective assistance to the whiteguards, who are making a last effort to force us into disaster. The meeting condemns these masked enemies of the people.

It declares to all those Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries who are really prepared to help us in our difficult struggle, that the workers' and peasants' government will grant them full liberty, and guarantee them all the rights of citizens of the Soviet Republic.

This meeting declares that the task of the Soviet Government at the present time is to wage relentless war upon those Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries who, like the literary and political groups, *Vsegda Vperyod!* and *Dyelo Naroda*,⁴⁸ are actually impeding our struggle and are the allies of our inveterate enemies. This meeting calls upon all working-class organisations, all proletarians, and all working peasants to exert every effort to repel the enemies of Soviet power, to defend that power and to improve the food supply and transport systems.

For this purpose, this meeting deems it necessary:

(1) To enlist members of the middle section—i.e., people who are less experienced than the advanced workers and peasants—to replace the weary advanced section.

(2) To engage still further contingents of the advanced and other sections of workers on food supplies, transport, and in the army.

(3) To enlist the largest possible number of politically-conscious workers and peasants to work at the People's Commissariat of Railways and at the State Control Commission, in order to improve the functioning of these bodies and to eliminate bureaucracy and red tape.

(4) To transfer the largest possible number of people from the starving cities to agricultural work in the rural districts—to vegetable gardens, to the Ukraine, to the Don region, and so forth, so as to increase the output of grain and other agricultural produce.

(5) To exert all efforts to help the middle peasants, to put a stop to the abuses from which they suffer so often, and to render them comradely assistance. Those Soviet officials who fail to understand this policy—which is the only correct policy—or who are unable to pursue it, must be immediately dismissed.

(6) The task that confronts everybody at the present time is to combat all signs of weariness, faint-heartedness and vacillation. We must imbue all hearts with courage and

firmness, increase political consciousness, and strengthen comradely discipline.

The working class and the peasantry of Russia have borne incredible burdens. During the past few months their sufferings have been more acute than ever. But this meeting declares that the will of the workers is not broken, that the working class is still at its post, that it is convinced that it will overcome all difficulties, and that it will maintain at all costs the victory of the Soviet Socialist Republic in Russia, and throughout the world.

Pravda No. 73,
April 4, 1919

Published according to
the *Pravda* text, verified
with the manuscript

LETTER TO THE PETROGRAD WORKERS ON AID FOR THE EASTERN FRONT

To the Petrograd workers

Comrades, the situation on the Eastern Front has become extremely grave. Today, Kolchak captured the Votkinsk Iron Works and Bugulma is in danger. Evidently, Kolchak will advance still farther.

The danger is a serious one.

Today, the Council of People's Commissars will decide on a number of urgent measures to assist the Eastern Front; we are increasing the work of agitation.

We request the Petrograd workers *to do everything possible, to mobilise all forces* to help the Eastern Front.

The soldier workers there will obtain food for themselves, and will be able to send food parcels to their families. The main thing, however, is that there the fate of the revolution is being decided.

By victory there, *we shall bring the war to a close, for the Whites will get no more assistance from abroad.* In the South, victory is near. We cannot withdraw forces from the South until we have won there completely.

Hence, *help the Eastern Front!*

Both the Soviet of Workers' and Red Army Deputies and the trade unions must exert every effort to mobilise all forces and render all possible assistance to the Eastern Front.

I am certain, comrades, that the Petrograd workers will set an example to the whole of Russia.

With communist greetings,
Lenin

Moscow, April 10, 1919

Petrogradskaya Pravda No. 81,
April 12, 1919

Published according to
the newspaper text

THESES OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS) ON THE SITUATION ON THE EASTERN FRONT

Kolchak's victories on the Eastern Front are creating an extremely grave danger for the Soviet Republic. Our efforts must be exerted to the utmost to smash Kolchak.

The Central Committee therefore instructs all Party organisations to concentrate their efforts first and foremost on the following measures, which must be carried out by the Party organisations and, in particular, by the trade unions in order to enlist wider sections of the working class in the active defence of the country.

1. Support in every way the mobilisation ordered on April 11, 1919.

All the forces of the Party and the trade unions must be mobilised immediately so as to render, within the next few days, without the slightest delay, the most energetic assistance to the mobilisation decreed by the Council of People's Commissars on April 10, 1919.

The mobilised men must at once be made to see the active participation of the trade unions and to feel that they have the support of the working class.

In particular, it must be made clear to every mobilised man that his immediate departure for the front will mean an improvement in his food situation; firstly, because of the better ration received by the soldiers in the grain-producing front-line zone; secondly, because of the fact that the food brought into the hungry gubernias will be distributed among fewer people; thirdly, because of the widely organised dispatch of food parcels by Red Army men in the front areas to their families at home.

The Central Committee demands of every Party and trade union organisation a weekly report, however brief, on what has been done to help mobilisation and the mobilised.

2. In the areas near the front, especially in the Volgaside region, trade union members must be armed to a man, and in the event of a shortage of arms, they must all be mobilised to render every possible aid to the Red Army, to replace casualties, etc.

Such towns as Pokrovsk, where the trade unions themselves decided to mobilise immediately 50 per cent of their members, should serve us as an example. The metropolitan cities and the large industrial centres must not lag behind Pokrovsk.

The trade unions everywhere must, using their own forces and means, carry out a check registration of their members in order that all who are not absolutely indispensable at home may be sent to fight for the Volga and the Urals territory.

3. The most serious attention must be given to intensifying agitational work, especially among those to be mobilised, those already mobilised and Red Army men. The usual methods of agitation—lectures, meetings, etc.—are not enough; agitation should be carried on among Red Army men by workers, singly or in groups; such groups of ordinary workers, members of trade unions, should be appointed specifically to barracks, Red Army units and factories. The trade unions must institute a check to see that every one of their members takes part in house-to-house agitation, distribution of leaflets and personal talks.

4. All male office workers are to be replaced by women, for which purpose a new registration, both Party and trade union, shall be carried out.

Special cards shall be introduced for all trade union members and all office workers, indicating the part they are personally taking in assisting the Red Army.

5. *Aid Bureaus* or *Committees of Action*, local and central, are to be instituted immediately through the trade unions, factory committees, Party organisations, co-operative societies, etc. Their addresses shall be published. The public shall be informed of them in the widest possible manner. Every man liable to mobilisation, every Red Army man,

and every person desirous of leaving for the South, for the Don or the Ukraine for food supply work should know that there is an aid bureau or a committee of action nearby; that it is accessible to every worker and peasant and he can obtain advice or instruction there, that contact with the army authorities will be facilitated for him, etc.

It shall be the special task of these bureaus to help to *equip the Red Army*. We can greatly increase the strength of our army if we improve the supply of arms, clothing, etc. And among the population there are still considerable quantities of arms which have been hidden or are not being used for the army. There are still considerable factory stocks of goods of various kinds needed by the army, and they must be quickly found and dispatched to the army. The army organisations in charge of supplies should be given immediate, broad and effective assistance by the general public. Every effort must be devoted to this matter.

6. The trade unions must organise the extensive enlistment of peasants, especially of peasant youths in the non-agricultural gubernias, for the ranks of the Red Army, for the formation of food detachments and for the food army in the Don and the Ukraine.

This activity can and should be expanded to many times its present volume; it helps both to assist the hungry population of the metropolitan cities and the non-agricultural gubernias and to strengthen the Red Army.

7. As regards the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Party line in the present situation is to imprison those who assist Kolchak, whether deliberately or unwittingly. In our republic of working people we shall not tolerate anybody who does not help us by deeds in the fight against Kolchak. Among the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries there are people who are willing to render such help. These people should be encouraged and given practical jobs, principally in the way of technical assistance to the Red Army in the rear, and their work must be strictly supervised.

The Central Committee appeals to all Party organisations and all trade unions to set to work in a revolutionary way, and not confine themselves to the old stereotyped methods.

We can defeat Kolchak. We can gain an early and final victory, because our victories in the South and the inter-

national situation, which is daily improving and changing in our favour, guarantee our ultimate triumph.

We must exert every effort, display revolutionary energy, and Kolchak will be rapidly defeated. The Volga, the Urals and Siberia can and must be defended and regained.

*Central Committee
of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks)*

Written April 11, 1919

Published in *Pravda* No. 79,
April 12, 1919

Published according to
the manuscript

**PLENARY MEETING OF THE ALL-RUSSIA
CENTRAL COUNCIL OF TRADE UNIONS⁴⁰**
APRIL 11, 1919

Brief report published
in *Izvestia* No. 80,
April 13, 1919

Published according to
the verbatim report

1

**REPORT ON THE TASKS OF THE TRADE UNIONS
IN THE MOBILISATION FOR THE EASTERN FRONT**

Comrades, you, of course, are all familiar with the decree published today on the mobilisation in the non-agricultural gubernias, and there is no need for me to deal at length with the reasons for this decree at a meeting like this; we may take it that you are well aware from what you have read in the newspapers that Kolchak's victories on the Eastern Front have suddenly made our position extremely grave.

You are aware that, in view of the situation at the front, all government instructions have for a long time been directed towards concentrating our main forces on the Southern Front. Krasnov's forces were concentrated in such large numbers on the Southern Front, and the avowedly counter-revolutionary Cossacks, who since 1905 have remained as monarchist as ever, were so strongly entrenched there, that without a victory on the Southern Front, the consolidation of Soviet proletarian power at the centre would have been impossible. It was in the South, in the Ukraine, that the Allied imperialists attempted to launch an offensive, and wanted to convert the Ukraine into a springboard against the Soviet Republic, making the Southern Front still more important for us; consequently, we have no reason to repent of having concentrated our attention and our forces on the Southern Front. I think that we were not mistaken in so doing. The latest news about the capture of Odessa, and the news received today about the capture of Simferopol and Eupatoria show the situation there; this region, which has played the decisive role throughout the war, has now been cleared.

You know perfectly well what tremendous effort it is costing to continue the Civil War after four years of imperialist war, how weary the masses are, how incredibly vast the sacrifices which the workers have been making during two years of Civil War. You know that this war is imposing an immense strain upon us. This concentration of all forces on the Southern Front greatly weakened the Eastern Front. We were unable to send reinforcements there and the army on the Eastern Front endured incredible hardships and sustained heavy losses. It fought for months, and a number of comrades working there sent us telegrams stating that it was becoming exceedingly difficult for the embattled Red Army to bear such an extremely heavy strain; the strength of our forces on the Eastern Front had been overtaxed. Meanwhile, Kolchak, by means of tsarist or "big stick" discipline, had mobilised the Siberian peasants. He weeded all men who had seen active service out of his army, and succeeded in concentrating there the old officers, as leaders, and the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. Relying on these, he has lately achieved successes on the Eastern Front which place the Volga in jeopardy; it must be admitted that to force him back we shall have to go all out. Forces must be sent from here, for we cannot shift any from the South; that would mean leaving the field to the main enemy, who has not yet been completely smashed.

Since our victories in the South and in the Don region, and because of the international situation, our general position has been improving daily. Not a day passes but what we receive news which indicates that our international situation is improving.

Three months ago, the British, French and American capitalists not only appeared to be, but actually were, a tremendous force, which, of course, could have crushed us had they at that time been in a position to use their vast material resources against us—they could have but did not and now it is obvious that they cannot. Their recent defeat in Odessa clearly shows that vast as the material resources of the imperialists were, from the purely military point of view, their campaign against Russia has collapsed completely. If we bear in mind that there are Soviet Republics in the heart of Europe, and that the growth of the

Soviet form of government is becoming irresistible, we may say without exaggeration, taking an absolutely sober view of the situation, that our victory on an international scale is absolutely certain.

If this were all, we could speak calmly, but in view of Kolchak's recent successes, it must be said that several months of strenuous effort still lie ahead of us before we can defeat his forces. There can be no doubt that we shall fail if we stick to the old methods; during the eighteen months of Soviet power our methods have become so familiar, sometimes even routine, that as a result, the energy of the advanced section of the working class has been largely exhausted. We do not shut our eyes to the extreme weariness that is felt among certain sections of the working class, and to the increasing difficulty of the struggle, but now our prospects are much simpler and clearer. Even those who do not side with Soviet power, and who regard themselves as rather important figures in politics, clearly see that on an international scale our victory is certain.

We have to go through one more phase of fierce civil war against Kolchak. We have therefore decided that the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions—a most authoritative body, which unites the broad masses of the proletariat—should, on its part, propose a number of most rigorous measures which should help us to finish off the war within the next few months. This is quite feasible, because our international situation is improving, we need have no doubts on that score. The European and American rear is in the best possible state for us, although five months ago we could not even dream of such a thing. We might say that Messrs. Wilson and Clemenceau have set out to help us. The cables which every day bring us news about their quarrels, about their desire to slam the door in each other's faces, show that these gentlemen are at each other's throats.

But the more clear it becomes that the victory of our cause on an international scale is certain, the more desperate and fierce become the efforts of the Russian landowners, capitalists and kulaks who fled across the Urals. This disreputable crowd is fighting desperately. You, of course, have read in the newspapers about how far white-

guard terror has gone in Ufa; there is no doubt that these whiteguard elements, these bourgeois, are staking everything on a last attempt. The bourgeoisie are desperate. They believe that by their desperate attack they will compel us to divert part of our forces from the decisive Southern Front. We shall not do that, and we say openly to the workers that this involves ever greater efforts in the East.

Permit me to propose a number of practical measures which, in my opinion, should create a regrouping of forces and set the trade unions new and definite tasks, and which I consider essential in view of the situation I have briefly outlined to you. There is no need for me to deal with this any further, you are all aware of it. It is possible in this situation—looking at it most soberly—to put an end to the war, both internal and international, within the next few months. But during those few months we shall have to bend every effort. The first task that should be set to the trade unions is the following:

"1. Support in every way the mobilisation ordered on April 11, 1919.

"All the forces of the Party and the trade unions must be mobilised immediately so as to render, within the next few days, without the slightest delay, the most energetic assistance to the mobilisation decreed by the Council of People's Commissars on April 10, 1919.

"The mobilised men must at once be made to see the active participation of the trade unions and to feel that they have the support of the working class.

"In particular, it must be made clear to every mobilised man that his immediate departure for the front will mean an improvement in his food situation; firstly, because of the better ration received by the soldiers in the grain-producing front-line zone; secondly, because of the fact that the food brought into the hungry gubernias will be distributed among fewer people; thirdly, because of the widely organised dispatch of food parcels by Red Army men in the front areas to their families at home...."

Of course, I have referred to the food situation here only very briefly; but you all realise that this is our main, internal difficulty, and were it not for the possibility of linking up the mobilisation with our rapid advance in

the areas near the front and the grain-producing districts, with the organisation of the units there, and not here, were it not for this possibility, the mobilisation would be hopeless; that is to say, it would be no use hoping for success. But at present we have this possibility. The mobilisation is to take place mainly in the non-agricultural gubernias, in the districts where the workers and peasants are suffering most from hunger. We can shift them primarily to the Don—the whole of the Don region is now in our hands, the fight against the Cossacks has been going on for a long time; we shall be able to improve the food supplies of our advanced units on the spot, and also organise the sending home of food parcels. Steps have already been taken in this direction, and permission has been given to send food parcels weighing twenty pounds twice a month. An agreement on this point has been reached. Thus, the privilege we were obliged to grant last year in the form of the right to carry one-and-a-half poods⁵⁰ can be compared with this wider measure, namely, the sending of food parcels, by means of which the men of the Red Army will be able to support their families at home.

By developing activities of this nature we shall combine assistance to the front with an improvement in the food situation in the chief non-agricultural districts, which are suffering most in this respect. Naturally, the dispatch of men to the Don will be linked up with the movement of men to the Volgaside area, where the enemy has now inflicted such a severe blow on us that beyond the Volga, in the East, we have already lost several million poods of grain that had been collected. There, the war is directly an out-and-out war for grain. The task of the trade unions is to see to it that this mobilisation is not carried out on the ordinary lines, but that it should be combined with trade union assistance to the Soviets. The thesis I have just read to you does not define this concretely enough. I think that this all-round assistance should be at first embodied in a series of tentative measures, which should be followed by definite instructions and a practical plan showing how the trade unions, by mobilising all their forces, should promote the mobilisation in such a way that it assumes the character of a major political measure

rather than a mere military and food supply measure, in such a way that it is made the task of a working class which realises that we can end the war within the next few months, because on an international scale we are assured of the arrival of fresh allies. Only proletarian organisations, only trade unions, can do this. I cannot enumerate the practical measures, I think that only the trade unions can do it. They can carry out the task, making allowances for specific local conditions, and organising the whole business on a practical basis. Our job is to give the main political directions to the working class, which must rally once again and take cognisance of this bitter truth; there will be new burdens to bear, but this is at the same time a truth that indicates the real and practical way to overcome our difficulties as quickly as possible. By sending large numbers of workers to the fertile South, we shall reinforce our forces there, and if the whiteguard and landowners' forces count on being able by their victories in the East to compel us to weaken the South, I think we shall prove to them that they are mistaken. I am quite sure that we shall not weaken the South and shall be able to provide support for the East. The enemy has mobilised the young men of Siberia and has avoided taking men who had seen active service—he is afraid of them and has mobilised the Siberian peasants. That is his last effort, his last resource. He has no support and no manpower. The Allies were unable to help him. It was beyond their power.

That is why I appeal to the representatives of the trade union movement to devote the greatest possible attention to this question and to see to it that the mobilisation is not carried out on the old lines. This must be a huge working-class political campaign; it is not merely a military and food supply campaign, but also a great political campaign. If the situation is weighed up soberly in the light of factors of the war and of class relationships, nobody can doubt that the issue should be settled within the next few months. To achieve this, the trade unions must not confine themselves to activity within the old limits. If they do they will be unable to carry out this task, which requires activity on a wider scale. They must act not only as trade unionists, but also as revolutionaries deciding the basic

question of the Soviet Republic, a question similar to the one decided in October—that of bringing the imperialist war to a close and launching socialist construction. Today, the trade unions must work as revolutionaries, on a mass scale; they must not keep within the old limits in settling the practical question of ending the Civil War in Russia. The end is very near, but it is extremely difficult. To proceed—

“2. In the areas near the front, especially in the Volga-side region, trade union members must be armed to a man, and in the event of a shortage of arms, they must all be mobilised to render every possible aid to the Red Army, to replace casualties, etc.

“3. The most serious attention must be given to intensifying agitational work, especially among those to be mobilised, those already mobilised and Red Army men. The usual methods of agitation—lectures, meetings, etc.—are not enough; agitation should be carried on among Red Army men by workers, singly or in groups; such groups of ordinary workers, members of trade unions, should be appointed specifically to barracks, Red Army units and factories. The trade unions must institute a check to see that every one of their members takes part in house-to-house agitation, distribution of leaflets and personal talks.”

We, of course, have grown somewhat unaccustomed to the methods of agitation we employed in the old days when we as a party were persecuted, or were fighting for power. Political power has placed a vast state machine in our hands, and through it agitation has been organised on new lines. During the past eighteen months it has been conducted on a different scale; but you know that because of the chaos we inherited from the imperialist war and which was intensified by the Civil War, and the terrible difficulties caused by the invasion of a number of Russian gubernias, our agitation has not done all that it should have done. Compared with past agitation it has done wonders but it is not all that is needed, and things have not been carried through to the end. Vast masses of peasants and workers are practically untouched by our agitation. That is why we must not keep within the old limits; under no circumstances must we depend on our having state

Soviet organisations for this purpose. If we were to rely on that, we would not be able to solve our problem. In this respect we should recall the past, pay more attention to personal initiative and say that if this personal initiative is developed on a mass scale, we shall do more than we did in the past, because the working class, even though most of its members are exhausted, has now instinctively understood the nature of the task. Even the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries who owing to their political ideology fought tooth and nail to prevent themselves from understanding the situation, who hid behind an iron fence and failed to understand reality—even these people now realise that all over the world the struggle is going on between the old bourgeois system and the new Soviet system. Ever since the German revolution revealed its real character, ever since the German Government showed that all it could do was murder the best leaders of the proletariat with the support of the social-patriots of the majority, and ever since Soviet power triumphed in a number of European countries, this question has been settled in practice. The question is—Soviet power or the old bourgeois order? It has been settled in practice on a historical scale. The workers' instinct decided the issue; this must be embodied in agitation increased tenfold.

We cannot increase food supplies when there is no food; we cannot increase the number of professional agitators and intellectuals tenfold when none are available. This we cannot do. But we can tell the broad masses of the workers that today they are not what they were until yesterday. If you set out to conduct personal agitation you will win by sheer weight of numbers.

And we shall have a mobilisation that is not an ordinary one, but is a real campaign to decide the ultimate fate of the working class which realises that only the next few months separate us from the last and decisive battle—not in the sense that this is meant in song and verse, but in the literal sense of the word, for we have weighed up our practical forces in other spheres and not only insofar as concerns the whiteguards.

During this year we have made a practical estimate of our forces relative to international imperialism. At one

time the Germans tried to throttle us, but we knew that they were hampered, that the British and French imperialists were hanging on to them with one hand. At one time we had the British and French against us. They had both hands free. Had they attacked us in December 1918, we could not have held out; we have now stood up to them for several more trying months and we know that their bourgeois order is decaying. Even their best troops were not fit for anything but to retreat before units of insurgents operating in the Ukraine. Our reasoning, therefore, is perfectly clear, and the working class has instinctively realised that we are on the eve of the last battle, that the next few months will decide whether we shall achieve final victory, or whether we shall have to go through fresh difficulties.

I shall read to you those of the other measures that are outlined here:

"4. All male office workers are to be replaced by women, for which purpose a new registration, both Party and trade union, shall be carried out....

"5. *Aid Bureaus or Committees of Action*, local and central, are to be instituted immediately through the trade unions, factory committees, Party organisations, co-operative societies, etc. Their addresses shall be published. The public shall be informed of them in the widest possible manner. Every man liable to mobilisation, every Red Army man, and every person desirous of leaving for the South, for the Don or the Ukraine for food supply work should know that there is an aid bureau or a committee of action nearby; that it is accessible to every worker and peasant and he can obtain advice or instruction there, that contact with the army authorities will be facilitated for him, etc.

"It shall be the special task of these¹ bureaus to help to *equip the Red Army*. We can greatly increase the strength of our army if we improve the supply of arms, clothing, etc. And among the population there are still considerable quantities of arms which have been hidden or are not being used for the army. There are still considerable factory stocks of goods of various kinds needed by the army, and they must be quickly found and dispatched to the army. The army organisations in charge of supplies should be

given immediate, broad and effective assistance by the general public. Every effort must be devoted to this matter."

I shall now touch upon the several different periods of our war tasks. Our first war problem we tackled by guerilla, irregular insurrections such as the comrades in the Ukraine are now resorting to. There is not so much a regular war in the Ukraine as a guerrilla movement and spontaneous insurrection. It results in very rapid attacks and creates extreme chaos in the midst of which the job of using stocks of food is one of incalculable difficulty. There is no old machinery, not even of the kind that we inherited from the Smolny period of our rule—and that was bad enough, and worked against us rather than for us. But why is there no such machinery in the Ukraine? Because it has not yet passed out of the phase of partisan warfare and spontaneous insurrection into the regular army phase, which is always characteristic of the consolidated power of every class, including the proletariat. We created our machinery after several months of untold difficulties.

We set up special food supply organisations. For a time we made some use of the services of the food supply experts, keeping them under Party supervision; now, however, we have everywhere army organisations in charge of supplies. When a period of extreme exertion of effort sets in, we say that we shall not revert to the old partisan methods, we have suffered enough from them; we urge that members of the working class shall be enlisted into the existing organised bodies, the regular organisations for supplying the Red Army. The working class in the mass can do that. You know that chaos reigns in the matter of equipment, in the matter of finding this equipment, of dispatching it, and so forth. Here help is needed in the work of supplying the Red Army. Our army experts say that we shall make progress if we mobilise a large number of soldiers who will speedily and finally decide the issue on the Eastern Front. But this is being held up mainly by the shortage of supplies, which is not surprising in view of the state of ruin we inherited from the imperialist war and the Civil War. But this means that we must appreciate and understand the new situation with its new tasks. A year ago we began to establish regular organisations, but this

is not enough; these regular organisations must receive the assistance of the mass movement, of the mass energy of the working class. Here we have an approximate outline of what the trade unions could do in this matter. The trade unions alone can do this, because they are closest to industry, and head the largest section of the workers, a section numbering millions. This task calls for a change in the tempo and the character of their activities for the next few months. In this way we shall be certain of complete victory within a few months.

"6. The trade unions must organise the extensive enlistment of peasants, especially of peasant youths in the non-agricultural gubernias, for the ranks of the Red Army, for the formation of food detachments and for the food army in the Don and the Ukraine.

"This activity can and should be expanded to many times its present volume; it helps both to assist the hungry population of the metropolitan cities and the non-agricultural gubernias and to strengthen the Red Army."

I have already said that our food supply and war tasks are closely connected, and you understand perfectly well that they must be. They must be linked up. One cannot be carried out without the other.

"7. As regards the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Party line in the present situation is to imprison those who assist Kolchak, whether deliberately or unwittingly. In our republic of working people we shall not tolerate anybody who does not help us by deeds in the fight against Kolchak. Among the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries there are people who are willing to render such help. These people should be encouraged and given practical jobs, principally in the way of technical assistance to the Red Army in the rear, and their work must be strictly supervised...."

In this respect we must say that lately we have been through an exceedingly severe and unpleasant experience. You know that the leading groups of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries looked at the matter in this way—"In spite of everything, we want to remain parliamentarians and condemn the Bolsheviks and Kolchak's followers alike." We had to tell them politely that this

is not the time for parliaments. Our enemies are trying to get us by the throat, and we are fighting the last and decisive battle. We shall not joke with them. When they foment strikes like this, they commit a heinous crime against the working class. Every strike costs the lives of thousands and thousands of Red Army men as we can see. The cessation of arms production in Tula means the death of thousands of workers and peasants; to deprive us of a number of factories in Tula means depriving thousands of workers of their lives. We say that we are fighting, we are spending our last ounce of strength, we regard this war as the only just and legitimate war. We have lit the torch of socialism at home and all over the world. We shall fight ruthlessly against anyone who hinders this struggle in the slightest. He who is not for us is against us. But what if there are people—and we know that there are such among the Mensheviks—who cannot, or will not, understand what is taking place in Russia? Who are not yet convinced that although in Russia the “wicked” Bolsheviks made such a revolution, in Germany, the birth-pangs of the revolution are immeasurably more severe? The democratic republic there—what is it? What is German freedom? It is freedom to murder the genuine leaders of the proletariat—Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, and scores of others. In this way the Scheidemann gang is only putting off the hour of its defeat. Obviously, those people cannot govern. Since November 9 there have been five months of freedom in the German Republic, and either the Scheidemann gang or their accomplices have been in power. But you know there is more squabbling among them than ever. This example proves that the only alternative is either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat. The fact that there is no middle course is shown, for example, by what we read today in the *Frankfurter Zeitung*.⁵¹ It says that the example of Hungary shows we must go forward to socialism. Hungary has proved that the bourgeoisie voluntarily surrenders power to the Soviets when they know that the country is in such a desperate position that nothing can save it, that nothing can lead the people along the difficult path of salvation but the Soviets. And to those who, wavering between the old and the new, say that

although ideologically they do not recognise the dictatorship of the proletariat they are, nevertheless, prepared to assist Soviet power and keep their convictions to themselves because they understand that in the midst of fierce war we must not argue, but fight—to those people we say: “If you want to engage in politics, meaning by politics that you, in front of the weary and tormented masses, will freely criticise Soviet power, not realising that in this way you are helping Kolchak—we say there will be ruthless war against you.” It is not easy to grasp the significance of and carry out such a policy at one stroke. We cannot pursue the same policy with regard to all of them. We tell them that if they want to engage in their politics, we shall provide a place for them in prison, or in other countries which are willing to receive them. We shall make these countries a present of several hundred Mensheviks. Or do you, at last, want to offer to help Soviet power, because otherwise there will be several more years of untold disaster, and in the end Soviet power will be victorious anyway. To people who talk like that we must give every encouragement; and we must give them practical work to do. This policy cannot be defined so easily and at one stroke as a policy which proceeds in one, single direction. But I am sure that every worker who has had practical experience of what the burden of war means, who knows what supplying the Red Army means, who knows the horrors every Red Army man at the front must go through—every worker will fully appreciate this lesson in politics. That is why I ask you to adopt these theses, and to concentrate all the efforts of the trade unions on the task of putting them into operation as speedily and vigorously as possible.

2

REPLY TO A QUESTION ON THE TULA STRIKE

I have no definite information about Tula and cannot speak as authoritatively on this matter as the preceding comrades did. But I do know the political physiognomy of the newspaper *Vsegda Vperyod!* This is nothing more nor less than incitement to strike. It is aiding and abetting our enemies, the Mensheviks, who are fomenting strikes. Somebody asked me if this had been proved. My reply is that if I were a barrister, a solicitor, or a member of Parliament, I would be obliged to present proof. But I am not the first, the second, or the third, and so I do not intend to and there is no reason why I should. Even supposing the Menshevik Central Committee is better than the Mensheviks in Tula who have been definitely exposed as fomentors of strikes—in fact I have no doubt some of the regular members of the Menshevik Committee are better—in a political struggle, when the whiteguards are trying to get us by the throat, is it possible to draw distinctions? Have we time for it? Facts are facts. Let us suppose that they were not aiding and abetting, but were weak and yielded to the Right Mensheviks; so what of it? The Right Mensheviks foment strikes, and Martov, or others, condemned these Rights in the newspapers. What does this teach us? We get a note saying “I, too, condemn, but”... (*A voice: “What else can they do?”*). They can do what the Bolshevik Party does—take their stand, not in words, but in deeds. Does not propaganda abroad take advantage of the conduct of the Mensheviks here? Did not the Berne Conference support all the imperialists when they said that the Bolsheviks were usurpers? We say—you have taken this stand at a

time when Kolchak's gangs are striking a blow that is causing the death of thousands of Red Army men in a country which the imperialists of the whole world are trying to crush. In two years' time, perhaps, after we have beaten Kolchak, we shall examine this matter, but not now. Now we must fight in order to defeat the enemy within the next few months; and you know what this enemy will do to the workers. You know this from what happened at Ivashchenkovo.⁵² You know what Kolchak is doing.

3

SPEECH CLOSING THE DISCUSSION

Comrades, one of the speakers, who was called the speaker for the Opposition, demanded in a resolution that we should turn to our Constitution. When I heard that I wondered whether the speaker was not confusing our Constitution with the Scheidemann Constitution. Scheidemann's, like that of all democratic republics, promises all citizens all sorts of liberties. Bourgeois republics have promised this to everybody for hundreds and thousands of years. You know what became of these bourgeois republics; you know that on a world-wide scale they have all collapsed. The vast majority of the workers side with the Communists. The word "Sovietist", which does not exist in the Russian language, is heard everywhere in the world. And we can say that no matter what country we go to, if we say the word "Sovietist", everybody will understand us and follow our lead. Clause 23 of the Constitution says:

"Guided by the interests of the working class as a whole, the R.S.F.S.R. deprives individual persons and individual groups of rights used, to the detriment of the socialist revolution."

We did not promise liberties right and left; on the contrary, we, in our Constitution, which has been translated into all languages—into German, English, Italian and French—said definitely that we shall deprive socialists of their liberties if they use them to the detriment of the socialist revolution, if they are used to cover up liberties for the capitalists. That is why this reference to the Constitution was wrong even from the formal point of view. We have openly stated that in the transition period, the

period of fierce struggle, we not only refrain from promising liberties right and left, but say in advance that we shall deprive of their liberties those citizens who hinder the socialist revolution. Who will judge whether they do so or not? The proletariat will.

Attempts have been made here to turn the question into one of parliamentary struggle. I have always said: parliamentarism is an excellent thing, but these are not parliamentary times. Hearing the government declare that the situation is grave, Comrade Lozovsky says that this is exactly the time for the people to present scores of demands. That is what all parliamentarians did in the "good old days"; but this is not the time for that sort of thing. I know that we suffer from a host of defects, I know that in Hungary Soviet power will be better than in this country. But when we are told in a period of mobilisation that this, that and the other are proposed, and that we should bargain over it, I say that these old parliamentary methods are useless; the class-conscious workers have already rejected them. This is not what we want.

We defined our main line as class struggle against the kulaks, against the rich elements who are opposed to us. Success in this being assured, we say that we must now establish more correct relations with the middle peasants. This is a very difficult job. In a period of grave danger you must help Soviet power, such as it is. We shall not change within the next few months. Here there is not and cannot be any middle course. Any attempt to create this middle course by artificial parliamentary methods would be stepping on to slippery ground. When one speaker said that the peasants are all opposed to us, this was one of those "little" exaggerations which in practice encourage the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks. The vast majority of the people know that by far most of the peasants are with us. For the first time they have Soviet power. Even the slogans of the insurrection (in which only an insignificant section of the peasant masses was involved) were "For Soviet power. For the Bolsheviks. Down with the communia". We say that the fight against this will be a very stubborn one, because the intelligentsia are sabotaging us on the sly. We have been obliged to take a larger number of

bad elements than good. Since the better elements of the intelligentsia turned their backs on us, we were obliged to take those that are not so good.

Comrade Romanov proposed a resolution which he himself formulated after his comrades had been arrested. "We demand freedom for all..." they declare. (*Lenin reads the resolution.*) The workers later resumed work, but this cost us several thousands of lost days and several thousands of lives of Red Army men, workers and peasants, on the Eastern Front.

I ask calmly and categorically which is better, to imprison several scores or hundreds of instigators, guilty or innocent, deliberate or unwitting, or lose thousands of Red Army men and workers? The first is better. I don't care whether I am accused of committing every mortal sin imaginable and of violating liberties, I plead guilty, but the interests of the workers will be furthered. At a time like this, when the people are exhausted, politically-conscious elements should help them to hold on for the next few months. It was not we who were victorious in Odessa. It is ridiculous to think that we were victorious. We captured Odessa because their soldiers refused to go into battle. I received a telegram from the Northern Front saying, "Send the British prisoners of war to the front." The comrades here say that the British are wailing and saying they will not go back into the army. What does that show? Their troops refuse to go into battle. They are ten times stronger than we are, and yet they refuse to fight.

That is why, when we are told that we promised a lot, but have done nothing, we say that we have done the main thing. We promised to start a revolution which will become a world revolution; it has begun, and it now stands so firmly on its feet that our international position is splendid. We fulfilled our main promise and, evidently, the vast majority of the class-conscious workers realise this. They realise that now only a few months separate us from victory over the capitalists all over the world. What are we to do in these few months if certain elements are exhausted; what should we do, play with them, incite them or, on the contrary, help the exhausted to hold out for those few months that will decide the fate of the entire war. You can see

that in the South we shall get the war over in less than a few months, we shall finish it off completely and release the army for the East. It is obvious, therefore, that the plans of the Entente—of the British, French and Americans—have gone awry. In Odessa, they had ten thousand men and a fleet—that is what the position was. This is not a matter of parliamentarism, or of concessions—on this we make no promises and undertake no obligations. We put the question this way—when the people are war weary, and are hard pressed by hunger, what should the class-conscious proletariat, the class-conscious section of the workers do? Permit people to play on this weariness, for it is becoming a game. If we say stop the war, the ignorant masses will vote for it, but the class-conscious section of the masses says that we can bring the war to a close within the next few months. The weary must be encouraged, sustained and led. The comrades themselves see that every class-conscious worker leads scores of tired people. We say this and we demand it. This is exactly what the dictatorship of the proletariat means—one class leads the other, because it is more organised, more solid and more class-conscious. The ignorant masses fall to every bait, and because of their weariness are ready to yield to anything. But the class-conscious section says that we must hold out, because in a few months we shall be victorious all over the world. This is how the matter stands. I take the liberty of thinking that the time has not yet come for parliamentary debates. We must make another big effort to achieve victory, and this time final victory, within the next few months.

**FOREWORD TO HENRI GUILBEAUX'S PAMPHLET
*SOCIALISM AND SYNDICALISM IN FRANCE
DURING THE WAR***

Comrade *Guilbeaux's* pamphlet is very well timed. The history of the socialist and trade union movements in a number of countries during the war should be summarised for all countries. This history shows as clearly as possible the slow but steady turn to the left, the progress towards revolutionary thinking and revolutionary action by the working class. This history discloses, on the one hand, the deep-going roots of the Third, Communist International, the preparations made for it, specific within each nation, depending upon its concrete historical features. A knowledge of the deep roots of the Third International is essential for an understanding of the inevitability of the International and of the difference in the paths leading the various national socialist parties to it.

On the other hand, the history of the socialist and trade union movements during the war shows us the beginning of the collapse of bourgeois democracy and bourgeois parliamentarism, the beginning of a turn from bourgeois democracy to Soviet, or proletarian, democracy. This tremendous epochal change is what many, very many socialists simply cannot understand yet, tied as they are by the chains of routine, philistine worship of what exists and existed yesterday, philistine blindness which prevents their seeing what is being brought into existence by the history of dying capitalism in all countries.

Comrade *Guilbeaux* undertook the task of writing an essay on the history of the French socialist and trade union

movements during the war. The clear and accurate enumeration of the facts gives the reader a vivid illustration of the beginning of a great turn, of the turning of the tide in the history of socialism. One may be certain that *Guilbeaux's* pamphlet will not only be most widely circulated among all class-conscious workers, but that it will also lead to the publication of a number of similar pamphlets on the war-time history of socialism and the working-class movement in other countries.

N. Lenin

Moscow, April 13, 1919

Published in French in 1919

First published in Russian in 1920

Published according to
the Russian version of
the pamphlet

**SPEECH DELIVERED AT THE FIRST MOSCOW
SOVIET COMMANDERS' COURSES
APRIL 15, 1919**

BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

Lenin recalled the words of a certain German general who said that if the soldiers knew what they were fighting for, there would be no war. The situation was different in our times. The Red Army had a great and definite task to perform—to emancipate the working class. The workers' and peasants' Red Army was growing and gaining strength day by day. This growth was due to the fact that the workers and peasants were profoundly conscious of their aims. And although they had suffered a number of reverses on the Eastern Front, they still had to halt Kolchak and defeat him. And they would do it. Krasnov's gangs had more than once created a serious situation for Soviet Russia, but in spite of the help they had been receiving from the whole of the bourgeois world, these gangs had been routed, and would soon suffer complete defeat. That had been achieved only because of the political consciousness of the workers and peasants. "In accepting this Red Flag from the District Committee," continued Lenin, "you must firmly and resolutely carry it forward. Every day brings us news to the effect that the Red Flag of liberty has been raised, now in one place, now in another. You have seen the formation of the Soviet Republic of Hungary, of Soviet Bavaria and of the Third, Communist International; and soon you will see the formation of the World Federative Republic of Soviets.

"Long live the World Federative Republic of Soviets!

"Long live the Red Army!

"Long live our Red Commanders!" (*Stormy applause.*)

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL AND ITS PLACE IN HISTORY

The imperialists of the Entente countries are blockading Russia in an effort to cut off the Soviet Republic, as a seat of infection, from the capitalist world. These people, who boast about their "democratic" institutions, are so blinded by their hatred of the Soviet Republic that they do not see how ridiculous they are making themselves. Just think of it, the advanced, most civilised and "democratic" countries, armed to the teeth and enjoying undivided military sway over the whole world, are mortally afraid of the *ideological* infection coming from a ruined, starving, backward, and even, they assert, semi-savage country!

This contradiction alone is opening the eyes of the working masses in all countries and helping to expose the hypocrisy of the imperialists Clemanceau, Lloyd George, Wilson and their governments.

We are being helped, however, not only by the capitalists' blind hatred of the Soviets, but also by their bickering among themselves, which induces them to put spokes in each other's wheels. They have entered into a veritable conspiracy of silence, for they are desperately afraid of the spread of true information about the Soviet Republic in general, and of its official documents in particular. Yet, *Le Temps*, the principal organ of the French bourgeoisie, has published a report on the foundation in Moscow of the Third, Communist International.

For this we express our most respectful thanks to the principal organ of the French bourgeoisie, to this leader of French chauvinism and imperialism. We are prepared to send an illuminated address to *Le Temps* in token of

our appreciation of the effective and able assistance it is giving us.

The manner in which *Le Temps* compiled its report on the basis of our wireless messages clearly and fully reveals the motive that prompted this organ of the money-bags. It wanted to have a dig at Wilson, as if to say, "Look at the people with whom you negotiate!" The wiseacres who write to the order of the money-bags do not see that their attempt to frighten Wilson with the Bolshevik bogey is becoming, in the eyes of the working people, an advertisement for the Bolsheviks. Once more, our most respectful thanks to the organ of the French millionaires!

The Third International has been founded in a world situation that does not allow prohibitions, petty and miserable devices of the Entente imperialists or of capitalist lackeys like the Scheidemanns in Germany and the Renners in Austria to prevent news of this International and sympathy for it spreading among the working class of the world. This situation has been brought about by the growth of the proletarian revolution, which is manifestly developing everywhere by leaps and bounds. It has been brought about by the *Soviet* movement among the working people, which has already achieved such strength as to become really *international*.

The First International (1864-72) laid the foundation of an international organisation of the workers for the preparation of their revolutionary attack on capital. The Second International (1889-1914) was an international organisation of the proletarian movement whose growth proceeded in *breadth*, at the cost of a temporary drop in the revolutionary level, a temporary strengthening of opportunism, which in the end led to the disgraceful collapse of this International.

The Third International actually emerged in 1918, when the long years of struggle against opportunism and social-chauvinism, especially during the war, led to the formation of Communist Parties in a number of countries. Officially, the Third International was founded at its First Congress, in March 1919, in Moscow. And the most characteristic feature of this International, its mission of fulfilling, of implementing the precepts of Marxism, and of achieving

the age-old ideals of socialism and the working-class movement—this most characteristic feature of the Third International has manifested itself immediately in the fact that the new, third, "International Working Men's Association" *has already begun to develop*, to a certain extent, into a *union of Soviet Socialist Republics*.

The First International laid the foundation of the proletarian, international struggle for socialism.

The Second International marked a period in which the soil was prepared for the broad, mass spread of the movement in a number of countries.

The Third International has gathered the fruits of the work of the Second International, discarded its opportunist, social-chauvinist, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois dross, and *has begun to implement* the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The international alliance of the parties which are leading the most revolutionary movement in the world, the movement of the proletariat for the overthrow of the yoke of capital, now rests on an unprecedentedly firm base, in the shape of several *Soviet republics*, which are implementing the dictatorship of the proletariat and are the embodiment of victory over capitalism on an international scale.

The epoch-making significance of the Third, Communist International lies in its having begun to give effect to Marx's cardinal slogan, the slogan which sums up the centuries-old development of socialism and the working-class movement, the slogan which is expressed in the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This prevision and this theory—the prevision and theory of a genius—are becoming a reality.

The Latin words have now been translated into the languages of all the peoples of contemporary Europe—more, into all the languages of the world.

A new era in world history has begun.

Mankind is throwing off the last form of slavery: capitalist, or wage, slavery.

By emancipating himself from slavery, man is for the first time advancing to real freedom.

How is it that one of the most backward countries of Europe was the first country to establish the dictatorship

of the proletariat, and to organise a Soviet republic? We shall hardly be wrong if we say that it is this contradiction between the backwardness of Russia and the "leap" she has made over bourgeois democracy to the highest form of democracy, to Soviet, or proletarian, democracy—it is this contradiction that has been one of the reasons (apart from the dead weight of opportunist habits and philistine prejudices that burdened the majority of the socialist leaders) why people in the West have had particular difficulty or have been slow in understanding the role of the Soviets.

The working people all over the world have instinctively grasped the significance of the Soviets as an instrument in the proletarian struggle and as a form of the proletarian state. But the "leaders", corrupted by opportunism, still continue to worship bourgeois democracy, which they call "democracy" in general.

Is it surprising that the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat has brought out primarily the "contradiction" between the backwardness of Russia and her "leap" *over* bourgeois democracy? It would have been surprising had history granted us the establishment of a *new* form of democracy *without* a number of contradictions.

If any Marxist, or any person, indeed, who has a general knowledge of modern science, were asked whether it is likely that the transition of the different capitalist countries to the dictatorship of the proletariat will take place in an identical or harmoniously proportionate way, his answer would undoubtedly be in the negative. There never has been and never could be even, harmonious, or proportionate development in the capitalist world. Each country has developed more strongly first one, then another aspect or feature or group of features of capitalism and of the working-class movement. The process of development has been uneven.

When France was carrying out her great bourgeois revolution and rousing the whole European continent to a historically new life, Britain proved to be at the head of the counter-revolutionary coalition, although at the same time she was much more developed capitalistically than France. The British working-class movement of that period,

however, brilliantly anticipated much that was contained in the future Marxism.

When Britain gave the world Chartism, the first broad, truly mass and politically organised proletarian revolutionary movement, bourgeois revolutions, most of them weak, were taking place on the European continent, and the first great civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie had broken out in France. The bourgeoisie defeated the various national contingents of the proletariat one by one, in different ways in different countries.

Britain was the model of a country in which, as Engels put it, the bourgeoisie had produced, alongside a bourgeois aristocracy, a very bourgeois upper stratum of the proletariat.⁵³ For several decades this advanced capitalist country lagged behind in the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. France seemed to have exhausted the strength of the proletariat in two heroic working-class revolts of 1848 and 1871 against the bourgeoisie that made very considerable contributions to world-historical development. Leadership in the International of the working-class movement then passed to Germany; that was in the seventies of the nineteenth century, when she lagged economically behind Britain and France. But when Germany had outstripped these two countries economically, i.e., by the second decade of the twentieth century, the Marxist workers' party of Germany, that model for the whole world, found itself headed by a handful of utter scoundrels, the most filthy blackguards—from Scheidemann and Noske to David and Legien—loathsome hangmen drawn from the workers' ranks who had sold themselves to the capitalists, who were in the service of the monarchy and the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

World history is leading unswervingly towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, but is doing so by paths that are anything but smooth, simple and straight.

When Karl Kautsky was still a Marxist and not the renegade from Marxism he became when he began to champion unity with the Scheidemanns and to support bourgeois democracy against Soviet, or proletarian, democracy, he wrote an article—this was at the turn of the century—entitled "The Slavs and Revolution". In this article he

traced the historical conditions that pointed to the possibility of leadership in the world revolutionary movement passing to the Slavs.

And so it has. Leadership in the revolutionary proletarian International has passed for a time—for a short time, it goes without saying—to the Russians, just as at various periods of the nineteenth century it was in the hands of the British, then of the French, then of the Germans.

I have had occasion more than once to say that it was easier for the Russians than for the advanced countries *to begin* the great proletarian revolution, but that it will be more difficult for them *to continue* it and carry it to final victory, in the sense of the complete organisation of a socialist society.

It was easier for us to begin, firstly, because the unusual—for twentieth-century Europe—political backwardness of the tsarist monarchy gave unusual strength to the revolutionary onslaught of the masses. Secondly, Russia's backwardness merged in a peculiar way the proletarian revolution against the bourgeoisie with the peasant revolution against the landowners. That is what we started from in October 1917, and we would not have achieved victory so easily then if we had not. As long ago as 1856, Marx spoke, in reference to Prussia, of the possibility of a peculiar combination of proletarian revolution and peasant war.⁶⁴ From the beginning of 1905 the Bolsheviks advocated the idea of a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. Thirdly, the 1905 revolution contributed enormously to the political education of the worker and peasant masses, because it familiarised their vanguard with "the last word" of socialism in the West and also because of the revolutionary *action* of the masses. Without such a "dress rehearsal" as we had in 1905, the revolutions of 1917—both the bourgeois, February revolution, and the proletarian, October revolution—would have been impossible. Fourthly, Russia's geographical conditions permitted her to hold out longer than other countries could have done against the superior military strength of the capitalist, advanced countries. Fifthly, the specific attitude of the proletariat towards the peasantry facilitated the transition from the bourgeois revolution to

the socialist revolution, made it easier for the urban proletarians to influence the semi-proletarian, poorer sections of the rural working people. Sixthly, long schooling in strike action and the experience of the European mass working-class movement facilitated the emergence—in a profound and rapidly intensifying revolutionary situation—of such a unique form of proletarian revolutionary organisation as the *Soviets*.

This list, of course, is incomplete; but it will suffice for the time being.

Soviet, or proletarian, democracy was born in Russia. Following the Paris Commune a second epoch-making step was taken. The proletarian and peasant Soviet Republic has proved to be the first stable socialist republic in the world. As a *new type of state* it cannot die. It no longer stands alone.

For the continuance and completion of the work of building socialism, much, very much is still required. Soviet republics in more developed countries, where the proletariat has greater weight and influence, have every chance of surpassing Russia once they take the path of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The bankrupt Second International is now dying and rotting alive. Actually, it is playing the role of lackey to the world bourgeoisie. It is a truly yellow International. Its foremost ideological leaders, such as Kautsky, laud *bourgeois* democracy and call it "democracy" in general, or—what is still more stupid and still more crude—"pure democracy".

Bourgeois democracy has outlived its day, just as the Second International has, though the International performed historically necessary and useful work when the task of the moment was to train the working-class masses within the framework of this bourgeois democracy.

No bourgeois republic, however democratic, ever was or could have been anything but a machine for the suppression of the working people by capital, an instrument of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the political rule of capital. The democratic bourgeois republic promised and proclaimed majority rule, but it could never put this

into effect as long as private ownership of the land and other means of production existed.

"Freedom" in the bourgeois-democratic republic was actually freedom *for the rich*. The proletarians and working peasants could and should have utilised it for the purpose of preparing their forces to overthrow capital, to overcome bourgeois democracy, but *in fact* the working masses were, as a general rule, unable to enjoy democracy under capitalism.

Soviet, or proletarian, democracy has for the first time in the world created *democracy* for the masses, for the working people, for the factory workers and small peasants.

Never yet has the world seen political power wielded by the *majority* of the population, power *actually* wielded by this majority, as it is in the case of Soviet rule.

It suppresses the "freedom" of the exploiters and their accomplices; it deprives them of "freedom" to exploit, "freedom" to batten on starvation, "freedom" to fight for the restoration of the rule of capital, "freedom" to compact with the foreign bourgeoisie against the workers and peasants of their own country.

Let the Kautskys champion such freedom. Only a renegade from Marxism, a renegade from socialism can do so.

In nothing is the bankruptcy of the ideological leaders of the Second International, people like Hilferding and Kautsky, so strikingly expressed as in their utter inability to understand the significance of Soviet, or proletarian, democracy, its relation to the Paris Commune, its place in history, its necessity as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The newspaper *Die Freiheit*, organ of the "Independent" (alias middle-class, philistine, petty-bourgeois) German Social-Democratic Party, in its issue No. 74 of February 11, 1919, published a manifesto "To the Revolutionary Proletariat of Germany".

This manifesto is signed by the Party executive and by all its members in the National Assembly, the German variety of our Constituent Assembly.

This manifesto accuses the Scheidemanns of wanting to abolish the *Workers' Councils*, and proposes—don't laugh!—that the Councils be *combined* with the Assembly, that the

Councils be granted certain political rights, a certain place in the Constitution.

To reconcile, to unite the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat! How simple! What a brilliantly philistine idea!

The only pity is that it was tried in Russia, under Kerensky, by the united Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, those petty-bourgeois democrats who imagine themselves socialists.

Anyone who has read Marx and failed to understand that in capitalist society, at every acute moment, in every serious class conflict, the alternative is either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat, has understood nothing of either the economic or the political doctrines of Marx.

But the brilliantly philistine idea of Hilferding, Kautsky and Co. of peacefully combining the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the proletariat requires special examination, if exhaustive treatment is to be given to the economic and political absurdities with which this most remarkable and comical manifesto of February 11 is packed. That will have to be put off for another article. ⁵⁵

Moscow, April 15, 1919

Published in May 1919

Published according to
the manuscript

**SPEECH AT A MEETING OF THE RAILWAYMEN
OF MOSCOW JUNCTION
APRIL 16, 1919**

Comrades, we all know that our country is now passing through difficult times. We have had to declare a mobilisation to repel the last onslaught of the counter-revolutionaries and of international imperialism. At the present time we need the effective assistance of the masses of the working people themselves to carry out this mobilisation successfully.

Comrades, all of you, of course, know perfectly well what colossal difficulties the war is causing and what enormous sacrifices it demands, particularly at the present time, when the country has to face the food difficulties and transport chaos as a result of the war. Owing to this, the sufferings that the masses of the working people have to bear as a consequence of this war have now become more acute than ever.

But we have every reason to think and assert that our position has improved, and that we shall surmount all our difficulties. We are not, however, harbouring any illusions. We know that at the present time our enemies, the capitalists of Britain, France and America, who are obviously working jointly with the Russian capitalists, are making a last effort to overthrow Soviet power. We see that the representatives of the landowners and the capitalists have been conferring in Paris for a long time now. We see that day after day and hour after hour they have greater hopes that Soviet power will collapse. But we also see that to this day, five months after their victory over Germany,

they have failed to conclude peace. Why? Because they are quarrelling among themselves over the division of the dainty morsels—who is to get Turkey, who is to get Bulgaria, how is Germany to be plundered, which titbits Britain, France and America are to have, how many billions to take in the form of indemnities from the Germans? It is obvious that they will get nothing from Germany, because that country has been ruined by the war, and the masses of the working people there are more and more vigorously resisting the oppression of the bourgeois government.

Comrades, because of all this we may be sure that at the present time, in view of Kolchak's victory on the Eastern Front, there has been a fresh burst of hope on the part of the Russian and foreign capitalists. But even though Kolchak may succeed in winning partial victories, they will never realise their hopes in respect of the Soviet Russian Republic.

We know that after their victory over Germany, the Allies were left with capital, an army millions strong, and a navy that knows no rival. Immediately after the defeat of Germany they had every opportunity of utilising all these forces for the purpose of conquering the Soviet Russian Republic. All that the Allied imperialists did in South Russia, their landing on the Black Sea coast and their occupation of Odessa, was directed against Soviet power.

But what do we see today, five months later? Did they not have military forces, a million-strong army, and a navy? Why did they have to retreat before the badly armed army of Ukrainian workers and peasants?

Because there is disaffection among their troops; this is proved by the information we have received, and which has been corroborated. A war for the division of capitalists' profits cannot be waged for four years with impunity. And now they have defeated Wilhelm, upon whom they put all the blame, they are unable to continue the war. We know that in the military sense the Entente countries were, and strictly speaking, still are, immeasurably stronger than we are. Nevertheless, we say that they have lost the war against us. This is not merely our imagination, or enthusiasm on our part, it has been proved by the events in the Ukraine. They cannot fight after all countries have been exhausted

by war, worn out by it, when it is becoming obvious to everybody that the war is being continued only for the purpose of preserving the power of capital over the working people. The Allies are still postponing the inevitable conclusion of peace with Russia, for the sake of which we have taken a number of steps, and have even offered terms that will be most burdensome for us. But we know that heavy financial burdens are immeasurably easier to bear than the continuation of the war, which deprives us of the younger generation of the workers and peasants. The imperialist governments know they cannot wage war against us. They know what the advance of Kolchak, who has mobilised several tens of thousands of young Siberian peasants, is really worth. He dared not recruit men who have seen active service, for he knew that they would not follow him, and he is able to keep control over these peasant lads only by brutal discipline and deception.

That is why we say with absolute conviction, although our position has become more acute, that we are in a position to bring this war to a close within the next few months and the Allies will be compelled to conclude peace with us. They are relying on Kolchak, they are counting on the food difficulties causing the collapse of Soviet power; nothing of the kind, we say. Of course, our food situation is by no means an easy one, and we know that still greater difficulties lie ahead. Nevertheless, we say that our position is nowhere near as bad as it was last year. At that time, last spring, the food shortage and the transport chaos were a greater threat than now.

In the first half of 1918 our food supply organisations were able to procure only twenty-eight million poods of grain, but in the second half of that year they obtained sixty-seven million poods. The first half of the year is always more difficult and the food shortage more severe. Last year, when the whole of the Ukraine was under the heel of the Germans, when Krasnov in the Don region received scores of carloads of military supplies from the Germans, and when the Czechoslovaks had captured the Volga area, the food situation was incomparably worse.

Now, the Russian Socialist Soviet Republic has been joined by others. The Latvian Republic has recently con-

solidated its position. There is disaffection among the German troops who advanced so rapidly, and the German soldiers say that they will not fight to restore the power of the barons. And the Ukraine, which Petlyura's gang captured for a short period, has now been entirely cleared of them and our Red troops are marching on to Bessarabia. We know that the international position of the Soviet Republic is becoming more stable every day, we may say, every hour. You all know that Soviet power has been established in Hungary, too, that a Soviet Republic has been set up there, and when it became evident that the Allies intended to plunder the country the bourgeoisie resigned and its place was taken by the workers.

Now, with the conquest of the Ukraine and the consolidation of Soviet power in the Don region, we are gaining strength. We can now say that we have sources of grain and food, and an opportunity of obtaining fuel from the Donets Basin. We are convinced, that, although the most difficult months are approaching, although the food crisis is more acute and our transport system is worn out and ruined, we shall nevertheless get over this crisis. In the Ukraine there are huge stocks of grain, surpluses that are difficult to take all at once; partisan warfare is still raging there, and the peasants, intimidated by the brutal rule of the Germans, are afraid to seize the landed estates. The first organisational steps in the Ukraine are difficult, just as they were here in the period when the Soviet government had its headquarters at Smolny.

We must send no less than three thousand railwaymen and a number of peasants from starving North Russia to the Ukraine. The Ukrainian Government has already issued a decree fixing the exact amount of grain that we may take at once at a hundred million poods.

According to our information, in one of the districts of the Donets Basin there are also a million poods of grain at a distance of not more than ten versts from the railway.

Last year we had no such stocks, no such resources, but we have them now. This shows that if we exert all our efforts for a short time we shall be able to bring the war to a close within the next few months. We have decisive preponderance in the South. The Allies—the French and

British—have lost their campaign and have discovered that with the insignificant number of troops at their command they cannot wage war against the Soviet Republic. The lies that they spread about us are being dispelled; nobody now believes the fairy-tale that the Bolsheviks overthrew the former government by force and are maintaining power by force. Everybody knows that the Soviet Republic is gaining strength every day.

We are mobilising you now because the outcome of the war depends on this mobilisation. We have every reason for stating that it will decide this issue in our favour, and the imperialists will be compelled to accept our offer of peace because their strength is waning day by day.

Comrades, this is why the Soviet government has decided to strain every nerve, to mobilise mainly the workers and the peasants of the non-agricultural gubernias. We think that this mobilisation, assuming we make a rapid advance at the front, will enable us also to improve the food situation, for it will reduce the number of consumers in the non-agricultural gubernias, where the famine is more acute. The tens of thousands of men who will be sent to the front—and we are fighting in the most fertile and well-fed districts of the country—will be able to obtain food for themselves, and if we develop the parcel post system, they will be able immediately to assist their families at home to a no less and perhaps even to a larger extent than under the pood-and-a-half system.

The possibility of bringing the war to a speedy close depends on this mobilisation; and on this mobilisation we base our hopes that Kolchak's advance will be checked and his forces routed. We do not want to weaken our forces in the South where they are winding up their victory over the remnants of Krasnov's gangs because we want to make sure of our hold over this most fertile district. We have captured almost the whole of the Don region; in the North Caucasus there are even larger stocks of grain which we are sure of getting hold of if we do not weaken the Southern Front.

Comrades, for the first time in the history of the world we are waging a war in which the workers and peasants, knowing, feeling and seeing that the burden of war is immense, suffering the pangs of starvation in a country which

is surrounded by the imperialists like a besieged fortress, understand that they are fighting for the land and factories. A nation in which the majority of the workers and peasants realise, feel and see that they are fighting for their own Soviet power, for the rule of the working people, for the cause whose victory will ensure them and their children all the benefits of culture, of all that has been created by human labour—such a nation can never be vanquished. And we are convinced, comrades, that this mobilisation will be carried through much better than previous mobilisations, that you will support it, that in addition to speakers at meetings, every one of you, and every one of your friends, will become a propagandist and go to his fellow-workers in the factories and on the railways and explain to them in plain language why it is necessary now to exert all efforts so as to crush the enemy within the next few months. The masses themselves will rise, they will all become agitators to a man, and create an invincible force that will ensure the existence of the Soviet Republic not only in Russia, but all over the world.

Pravda No. 85,
April 23, 1919

Published according to
the *Pravda* text

THE FIGHT AGAINST KOLCHAK
SPEECH AT A CONFERENCE OF MOSCOW FACTORY
COMMITTEES AND TRADE UNIONS
APRIL 17, 1919
NEWSPAPER REPORT

Lenin, in a vigorous speech, called upon the Moscow proletariat to take a direct part in the fight against Kolchak. Kolchak's latest offensive, he said, was undoubtedly instigated by the imperialist powers of the Entente. The fact that the Entente was directing all the movements of the whiteguards in the border regions was proved by the telegram received from Comrade Stučka the day before to the effect that the Germans in Courland had stopped their offensive, but the Soviet Government in Latvia could not conclude peace with them because France, Britain and America were demanding that the Germans remain in Courland and continue the war. The German generals were willing to obey the victors, but the German soldiers emphatically refused to fight. The Allies' last card had been beaten. The victories in the South had shown that the Allies lack the forces with which to wage war against the Soviet Republic, or rather, they had lost control over their forces. The Allies' gamble in the South had ended in a shameful act of plunder when they fled from Odessa. The "enlightened" Allies accused the Soviets of committing acts of robbery and violence, but themselves robbed the Soviets of their merchant fleet which they took from Odessa without any right or justification, thereby dooming the civil population to starvation. This was an act of revenge for the

collapse of their imperialist plans. The Republic had wound up the Southern and Crimean fronts and was on the verge of winding up the Don Front. According to the latest information received, the Red Army was forty versts from Novocherkassk and victory was assured. #

Kolchak's offensive had been instigated by the Allies in order to divert Soviet forces from the Southern Front and give the remnants of the whiteguard forces and Petlyura's gangs in the South an opportunity to recuperate, but the plan would fail. The Soviets would not withdraw a single regiment, or a single company, from the Southern Front.

A new army would be organised for the Eastern Front, and for this purpose mobilisation had been ordered. This mobilisation would be the last. It would enable the Soviets to put an end to Kolchak, i.e., to put an end to the war, and this time for good.

The mobilisation had been ordered solely for the non-agricultural, industrial gubernias. In drawing up the plan for this mobilisation attention had been paid not only to the interests of the war, but also to the interests of agriculture and food supplies. People were being transferred from the starving gubernias to the grain-producing regions. To a large extent this mobilisation would relieve the food situation in the metropolitan cities and the northern gubernias. All mobilised men would be allowed to send their families at home two food parcels a month, and in this way the working population would be able to obtain bread from their relatives at the front. According to the report of the Commissar for Posts and Telegraphs, food parcels played an important part in supplying food for the towns; in one day 37 carloads of food parcels had arrived. This measure would undoubtedly be more effective and more palpable than the pood-and-a-half experiment made last year.

The mobilisation had been properly conceived and planned, but to be successful it would have to be carried out in an unbureaucratic way. It had to be borne in mind that the mobilisation would be of decisive importance, and every effort had to be made to carry it out. Every class-conscious working man and every class-conscious working woman

would have to take a direct part in it. Conferences and mass meetings were not enough. What was needed was individual agitation. Every man liable to mobilisation should be personally visited. Every one of them should be convinced individually that the ending of the war depended on his courage, his determination and his devotion.

The proletarian revolution was spreading to all countries of the world, continued Lenin. The fact that the Allies had practically abandoned open military intervention in Russia's affairs was due to their inability to control their own armies, which had instinctively felt the effects of the Russian revolution. They were afraid of their own soldiers and workers, whom they were trying to shield from the influence of the Russian revolution. Lately, even newspaper reports of the successes of Bolshevism had been prohibited in the Allied countries. In Italy, a barrier had been set up to keep out even private letters from Russia. Lenin said that the other day he had received a letter from the well-known Italian socialist, Morgari, who had been very moderate at the Zimmerwald Conference. This letter had been sent through secret channels and was written on tiny scraps of paper, like Party correspondence in tsarist times.

In this secret letter, Morgari wrote: "On behalf of the Italian Party I send most hearty greetings to the Russian comrades and to the Soviet government." (*Stormy applause.*)

Everybody knew that the bourgeois government had voluntarily resigned in Hungary, voluntarily released Béla Kun from prison; he was a Hungarian army officer, a Communist, who had been a prisoner of war in Russia, had fought actively in the ranks of the Russian Communists, and had taken part in the suppression of the Left Socialist-Revolutionary insurrection in July last year. This formerly persecuted, slandered and tormented Hungarian Bolshevik had become practically the leader of the Hungarian Soviet Government. Compared with Russia, Hungary was a small country; but the Hungarian revolution would, perhaps, play a more important role in history than the Russian revolution. The people in that cultured country were taking into account the entire experience of the Russian revolution. They were firmly applying the principle of socialisation, and owing to the ground having been

better prepared there, the edifice of socialism was being built more systematically and successfully.

And at that very moment when it could be said with certainty that the cause of international imperialism was lost for ever, danger was looming in the East in the shape of Kolchak's brutal and desperate whiteguard hordes. This had got to be stopped. By putting an end to Kolchak they would put an end to the war for good. All efforts must be exerted. Every class-conscious proletarian would have to take part in the mobilisation. Every class-conscious working man and working woman would have to devote every spare moment to the work of individual agitation. They would not have to submit to this strain for long; a few months, or a few weeks, perhaps; but it would be the last and final effort, for victory was certain.

Izvestia No. 84,
April 18, 1919

Published according to
the *Izvestia* text

**SPEECH AT THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS
OF COMMUNIST STUDENTS
APRIL 17, 1919⁵⁶**

It gives me great pleasure to greet you. I do not know how many gubernias are represented here, or where you have come from. The important thing is that the youth, the communist youth, are organising. The important thing is that the youth are gathering together to learn to build the new type of school. Now you have a new type of school. The old, bureaucratic school, which you hated and detested, and with which you had no ties, no longer exists. We have planned our work for a very long period. The future society we are striving for, the society in which all must work, the society in which there will be no class distinctions, will take a long time to build. At present we are only laying the foundations of this future society, but you will have to build it when you grow up. At present, work as your strength permits; do not undertake tasks that are too much for you; be guided by your seniors. Once again I greet this Congress and wish your labours every success.

MESSAGE OF GREETINGS TO THE BAVARIAN SOVIET REPUBLIC

We thank you for your message of greetings, and on our part whole-heartedly greet the Soviet Republic of Bavaria. We ask you insistently to give us more frequent, definite information on the following. What measures have you taken to fight the bourgeois executioners, the Scheidemanns and Co.; have councils of workers and servants been formed in the different sections of the city; have the workers been armed; have the bourgeoisie been disarmed; has use been made of the stocks of clothing and other items for immediate and extensive aid to the workers, and especially to the farm labourers and small peasants; have the capitalist factories and wealth in Munich and the capitalist farms in its environs been confiscated; have mortgage and rent payments by small peasants been cancelled; have the wages of farm labourers and unskilled workers been doubled or trebled; have all paper stocks and all printing-presses been confiscated so as to enable popular leaflets and newspapers to be printed for the masses; has the six-hour working day with two- or three-hour instruction in state administration been introduced; have the bourgeoisie in Munich been made to give up surplus housing so that workers may be immediately moved into comfortable flats; have you taken over all the banks; have you taken hostages from the ranks of the bourgeoisie; have you introduced higher rations for the workers than for the bourgeoisie; have all the workers been mobilised for defence and for ideological propaganda in the neighbouring villages? The most urgent and most extensive implementation of these and similar measures,

coupled with the initiative of workers', farm labourers' and—acting apart from them—small peasants' councils, should strengthen your position. An emergency tax must be levied on the bourgeoisie, and an actual improvement effected in the condition of the workers, farm labourers and small peasants at once and at all costs.

With sincere greetings and wishes of success.

Lenin

Published according to
the manuscript

TELEGRAM
TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL
OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARS OF THE UKRAINE

The resolution passed by the Ekaterinoslav Socialist-Revolutionaries shows that those scoundrels are advocates of the kulaks. There must be a newspaper campaign against them on the grounds of their defence of the kulaks and their slogan "oppose centralisation"; it must be required of them that they expose the kulaks and struggle against the free sale of grain by peasants. In the government they must be tied down by precise directives and kept under strict surveillance and in the event of there being the slightest deviation from the government's policy on food, co-operatives and finances and on the question of the closest collaboration with Russia, preparations must be made to expel them in disgrace. Keep me more frequently informed.

Lenin

Written late in April 1919

First published in the Fourth
(Russian) Edition of the
Collected Works

Published according to
the manuscript

THREE SPEECHES DELIVERED IN RED SQUARE MAY 1, 1919

NEWSPAPER REPORTS

1

Lenin's appearance among the demonstrators was greeted with a lengthy ovation. After greeting the Moscow and world proletariat, Lenin compared the May Day celebrations of the previous year with the present celebrations. In the course of the year, he said, the political situation had changed considerably in favour of Soviet power. On May the First the year before they had been threatened by German imperialism, it had been routed and dispersed.

The conditions under which the proletarian festival was being celebrated had changed in other countries as well. The workers in all countries were taking the path of struggle against imperialism. The emancipated working class was triumphantly celebrating its festival freely and openly not only in Soviet Russia, but also in Soviet Hungary, and in Soviet Bavaria.

"And we can say with certainty," continued Lenin, "that not only in Red Moscow, in Red Petrograd and in Budapest, but in all large proletarian centres, the workers, who have come out into the streets today not merely to take the air but to demonstrate their strength, are talking about the significance of Soviet power and of the early triumph of the proletariat."

Going on to deal with the threats of Anglo-French imperialism, Lenin said that considering that Anglo-French imperialists had been compelled to retire from the battlefield in the Ukraine, where small units of insurgents were

operating, they would certainly be unable to resist the united forces of Soviet Russia, Hungary and Bavaria. Their withdrawal from Odessa and the Crimea had shown that the British and French soldiers did not wish to fight against Soviet Russia, and this was the pledge of Soviet victory.

Lenin then read a telegram he had received from Comrade Kamenev to the effect that Sevastopol had been entirely cleared of French forces.

"Thus, today," he said, "the Red Flag of the proletariat, which is celebrating its day of liberation from the imperialist gangs, is flying over liberated Sevastopol." (*Lengthy ovation. Shouts of "Hurrah" repeated for a long time.*)

Dealing with the Kolchak danger, Lenin said that the latest reports from the front gave them grounds to believe that victory over Kolchak was quite near. Tens and hundreds of thousands of men were being sent to the front, and these would completely destroy Kolchak's gangs.

In conclusion, Lenin expressed his confidence in the final victory of Soviet power all over the world and exclaimed: "Long live the world Soviet republic! Long live communism!"

Published in *Izvestia* No. 93,
May 3, 1919

Published according to
the *Izvestia* text

2

"The majority of those here present are no older than 30 to 35 years of age," said Lenin, "and they will live to see the full bloom of communism, from which we are still remote."

Pointing to the children, Lenin said that they, who were taking part in the celebration of the festival of the emancipation of labour, would fully enjoy the fruits of the labours and sacrifices of the revolutionaries.

"Our grandchildren will examine the documents and other relics of the epoch of the capitalist system with amazement. It will be difficult for them to picture to themselves how the trade in articles of primary necessity could remain in private hands, how factories could belong to individuals, how some men could exploit others, how it was possible for those who did not work to exist. Up to now the story of what our children would see in the future has sounded like a fairy-tale; but today, comrades, you clearly see that the edifice of socialist society, of which we have laid the foundations, is not a utopia. Our children will build this edifice with even greater zeal." (*Stormy applause.*)

Published in *Vecherniye Izvestia*
Moskovskogo Sovieta No. 230,
May 2, 1919

Published according to
the newspaper text

3

SPEECH AT THE UNVEILING OF A MONUMENT
TO STEPAN RAZIN ON LOBNOYE MESTO *

(*Stormy applause*). Comrades, we are today celebrating May Day in company with proletarians throughout the world who thirst for the overthrow of capital. This Lobnoye Mesto is a reminder of how many centuries of torment were suffered by the working people under the yoke of the oppressors, for the power of capital never could be maintained except by the force and oppression that even in past times aroused indignation. This monument is erected to one who represented the rebellious peasants. On this spot he laid down his life in the struggle for freedom. Russian revolutionaries have made many sacrifices in the struggle against capital. The best of the proletarians and the peasants, the freedom fighters, perished, but it was not in the fight for the sort of freedom capital offers, freedom in which the banks, private factories and profiteering are retained. Down with such freedom! What we need is real freedom and that is possible only when society consists entirely of working people. To achieve such freedom much labour and many sacrifices will be required. We shall do everything possible to achieve that great aim, to build socialism. (*Stormy applause*).

Published in *Vecherniye Izvestia*
Moskovskogo Sovieta No. 230,
May 2, 1919

Published according to
the newspaper text

* Lobnoye Mesto is a round stone dais in Red Square. Royal edicts and death sentences were announced from it in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In 1671, Stepan Razin, leader of the peasant revolt of 1667-71, was executed there.—*Ed.*

**FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS
ON ADULT EDUCATION**

MAY 6-19, 1919

Published in the pamphlet:
N. Lenin, *Two Speeches at
the First All-Russia Congress
on Adult Education,*
Moscow, 1919

Published according to
the pamphlet

1

SPEECH OF GREETING
MAY 6

Comrades, it gives me pleasure to greet the Congress on adult education. You do not, of course, expect me to deliver a speech that goes deeply into this subject, like that delivered by the preceding speaker, Comrade Lunacharsky, who is well-informed on the matter and has made a special study of it. Permit me to confine myself to a few words of greeting and to the observations I have made and thoughts that have occurred to me in the Council of People's Commissars when dealing more or less closely with your work. I am sure that there is not another sphere of Soviet activity in which such enormous progress has been made during the past eighteen months as in the sphere of adult education. Undoubtedly, it has been easier for us and for you to work in this sphere than in others. Here we had to cast aside the old obstacles and the old hindrances. Here it was much easier to do something to meet the tremendous demand for knowledge, for free education and free development, which was felt most among the masses of the workers and peasants; for while the mighty pressure of the masses made it easy for us to remove the external obstacles that stood in their path, to break up the historical bourgeois institutions which bound us to imperialist war and doomed Russia to bear the enormous burden that resulted from this war, we nevertheless felt acutely how heavy the task of re-educating the masses was, the task of organisation and instruction, spreading knowledge, combating that heritage of ignorance, primitiveness, barbarism and savagery that we took over. In this field the struggle had to be waged by

entirely different methods; we could count only on the prolonged success and the persistent and systematic influence of the leading sections of the population, an influence which the masses willingly submit to, but often we are guilty of doing less than we could do. I think that in taking these first steps to spread adult education, education, free from the old limits and conventionalities, which the adult population welcomes so much, we had at first to contend with two obstacles. Both these obstacles we inherited from the old capitalist society, which is clinging to us to this day, is dragging us down by thousands and millions of threads, ropes and chains.

The first was the plethora of bourgeois intellectuals, who very often regarded the new type of workers' and peasants' educational institution as the most convenient field for testing their individual theories in philosophy and culture, and in which, very often, the most absurd ideas were hailed as something new, and the supernatural and incongruous were offered as purely proletarian art and proletarian culture.⁵⁷ (*Applause.*) This was natural and, perhaps, pardonable in the early days, and the broad movement cannot be blamed for it. I hope that, in the long run, we shall try to get rid of all this and shall succeed.

The second was also inherited from capitalism. The broad masses of the petty-bourgeois working people who were thirsting for knowledge, broke down the old system, but could not propose anything of an organising or organised nature. I had opportunities to observe this in the Council of People's Commissars when the mobilisation of literate persons and the Library Department were discussed, and from these brief observations I realised the seriousness of the situation in this field. True, it is not quite customary to refer to something bad in a speech of greeting. I hope that you are free from these conventionalities, and will not be offended with me for telling you of my somewhat sad observations. When we raised the question of mobilising literate persons, the most striking thing was the brilliant victory achieved by our revolution without immediately emerging from the limits of the bourgeois revolution. It gave freedom for development to the available forces, but these available forces were petty bourgeois and their watch-

word was the old one—each for himself and God for all—the very same accursed capitalist slogan which can never lead to anything but Kolchak and bourgeois restoration. If we review what we are doing to educate the illiterate, I think we shall have to draw the conclusion that we have done very little, and that our duty in this field is to realise that the organisation of proletarian elements is essential. It is not the ridiculous phrases which remain on paper that matter, but the introduction of measures which the people need urgently and which would compel every literate person to regard it his duty to instruct several illiterate persons. This is what our decree says⁵⁸; but in this field hardly anything has been done.

When another question was dealt with in the Council of People's Commissars, that of the libraries, I said that the complaints we are constantly hearing about our industrial backwardness being to blame, about our having few books and being unable to produce enough—these complaints, I told myself, are justified. We have no fuel, of course, our factories are idle, we have little paper and we cannot produce books. All this is true, but it is also true that we cannot get at the books that are available. Here we continue to suffer from peasant simplicity and peasant helplessness; when the peasant ransacks the squire's library he runs home in the fear that somebody will take the books away from him, because he cannot conceive of just distribution, of state property that is not something hateful, but is the common property of the workers and of the working people generally. The ignorant masses of peasants are not to blame for this, and as far as the development of the revolution is concerned it is quite legitimate, it is an inevitable stage, and when the peasant took the library and kept it hidden, he could not do otherwise, for he did not know that all the libraries in Russia could be amalgamated and that there would be enough books to satisfy those who can read and to teach those who cannot. At present we must combat the survivals of disorganisation, chaos, and ridiculous departmental wrangling. This must be our main task. We must take up the simple and urgent matter of mobilising the literate to combat illiteracy. We must utilise the books that are available and set to work to organise a network of

libraries which will help the people to gain access to every available book; there must be no parallel organisations, but a single, uniform planned organisation. This small matter reflects one of the fundamental tasks of our revolution. If it fails to carry out this task, if it fails to set about creating a really systematic and uniform organisation in place of our Russian chaos and inefficiency, then this revolution will remain a bourgeois revolution because the major specific feature of the proletarian revolution which is marching towards communism is this organisation—for all the bourgeoisie wanted was to break up the old system and allow freedom for the development of peasant farming, which revived the same capitalism as in all earlier revolutions.

Since we call ourselves the Communist Party, we must understand that only now that we have removed the external obstacles and have broken down the old institutions have we come face to face with the primary task of a genuine proletarian revolution in all its magnitude, namely, that of organising tens and hundreds of millions of people. After the eighteen months' experience that we all have acquired in this field, we must at last take the right road that will lead to victory over the lack of culture, and over the ignorance and barbarism from which we have suffered all this time. (*Stormy applause.*)

2

DECEPTION OF THE PEOPLE WITH SLOGANS
OF FREEDOM AND EQUALITY
MAY 19

Comrades, instead of an appraisal of the current situation, which I think some of you expect today, permit me to answer the most important political questions—not only theoretical, of course, but also practical—which now loom before us, characterise the entire stage of the Soviet revolution and give rise to most controversy; they give rise to most of attacks by people who think they are socialists, and they cause most confusion in the minds of people who think they are democrats and who are particularly fond of accusing us of violating democracy. It seems to me that these general political questions are too often, even constantly, to be found in all present-day propaganda and agitation, and in all anti-Bolshevik literature—when, of course, this literature rises slightly above the level of the downright lying, slander and vituperation of all organs of the bourgeois press. If we take the literature of a slightly higher level I think we shall find that the fundamental questions are the relations between democracy and dictatorship, the tasks of the revolutionary class in a revolutionary period, the tasks of the transition to socialism in general, and the relations between the working class and the peasantry; I think that these questions serve as the main basis for all present-day political controversies, and although it may sometimes seem to you that it is something of a digression from the immediate topics of the day, the explanation of these issues should be our chief duty. I can-

not, of course, undertake to cover all these questions in a short lecture. I have chosen some, which I should like to talk to you about.

I

The first point I have chosen is that of the difficulties of every revolution, of every transition to a new system. If you examine the attacks that are made against the Bolsheviks by people who think that they are socialists and democrats—and as examples of such I can quote the groups of writers in *Vsegda Vperyod!* and *Dyelo Naroda*, newspapers which in my opinion have quite rightly been suppressed in the interests of the revolution, and the representatives of which most often resort to theoretical criticism in attacks of the type natural for organs which our authorities regard as counter-revolutionary—if you examine the attacks on Bolshevism made by this camp, you will find that a constant accusation is the following: “The Bolsheviks promised you, the working people, bread, peace and freedom; but they have not given you bread, or peace, or freedom, they have deceived you, and they have deceived you by abandoning democracy.” I shall deal with the departure from democracy separately. At present I will take the other side of this accusation—“The Bolsheviks promised bread, peace and freedom, but the Bolsheviks gave you a continuation of the war, an exceptionally fierce and stubborn struggle, a war of all the imperialists, of the capitalists of all the Entente countries—which means of the most civilised and advanced countries—against tormented, tortured, backward and weary Russia.” And these accusations, I repeat, you will find in both the newspapers I have mentioned; you will hear them made in conversation with every bourgeois intellectual who, of course, thinks that he is not bourgeois; you will constantly hear them in conversation with every philistine. And so I ask you to give some thought to this sort of accusation.

Yes, the Bolsheviks did set out to make a revolution against the bourgeoisie, to overthrow the bourgeois government violently, to break away from all the traditional customs, promises and commandments of bourgeois democracy; they did set out to wage a most desperate and violent

struggle and war to crush the propertied classes; they did this to extricate Russia, and then the whole of mankind, from the imperialist slaughter and to put an end to all war. Yes, the Bolsheviks did set out to make a revolution in order to achieve all this, and, of course, they have never thought of abandoning this fundamental and main object. Nor is there any doubt that the attempts to emerge from this imperialist slaughter, to smash the rule of the bourgeoisie, prompted all the civilised countries to attack Russia; for such is the political programme of France, Britain and America, no matter how much they insist that they have abandoned the idea of intervention. No matter how much the Lloyd Georges, Wilsons and Clemenceaus may assure us that they have abandoned the idea of intervention, we know that they are lying. We know that the Allied warships which left, and were compelled to leave, Odessa and Sevastopol, are now blockading the Black Sea coast, and are even giving artillery cover to that part of the Crimean Peninsula, near Kerch, where the volunteers⁵⁹ are concentrated. They say: "We cannot surrender this to you. Even if the volunteers fail to cope with you, we cannot surrender this part of the Crimean Peninsula, because, if we did, you would be masters of the Azov Sea, you will cut us off from Denikin and prevent us from sending supplies to our friends." Or take the offensive now developing against Petrograd. Yesterday one of our destroyers fought against four enemy destroyers. Is it not clear that this is intervention? Is not the British navy taking part in it? Is not the same thing happening in Archangel and Siberia? The fact is that the whole civilised world is now fighting against Russia. .

The question is, did we contradict ourselves when we called upon the working people to make a revolution, promising them peace, and brought things to the pitch that the whole civilised world is now attacking weak, weary, backward and ruined Russia? Or are those who have the presumption to hurl such a reproach at us acting in contradiction to the elementary concepts of democracy and socialism? That is the question. To present this question in its theoretical, general form, I shall draw an analogy. We talk about the revolutionary class, the revolutionary

policy of the people, but I suggest you take an individual revolutionary. Take, for example, Chernyshevsky, and appraise his activities. What would be the appraisal of an absolutely ignorant man? Probably he would say: "Well, the man wrecked his own life, found himself in Siberia, and achieved nothing." This is a sample. If we were to hear an argument like this from some unknown person we would say: "At best it comes from a man who is hopelessly ignorant and who is, perhaps, not to blame for being so ignorant that he cannot understand the importance of the activities of an individual revolutionary in the general chain of revolutionary events; or else it comes from a scoundrel, a supporter of reaction, who is deliberately trying to frighten the working people away from the revolution." I took the example of Chernyshevsky because, no matter which trend the people who call themselves socialists may belong to, there cannot be any serious disagreement in their appraisal of this individual revolutionary. Everybody will agree that if an individual revolutionary is appraised from the point of view of the outwardly useless and often fruitless sacrifices he has made and the nature of his activities and their connection with the activities of preceding and succeeding revolutionaries is ignored—if the importance of his activities is appraised from this point of view, it is due either to complete ignorance, or to a vicious and hypocritical defence of the interests of reaction, oppression, exploitation and class tyranny. On this point there can be no disagreement.

Now I ask you to carry your thoughts from the individual revolutionary to the revolution of a whole nation, of a whole country. Has any Bolshevik ever denied that the revolution can be finally victorious only when it embraces all, or at all events, some of the most important advanced countries? We have always said that. Did we ever say that it was possible to emerge from the imperialist war simply by the men sticking their bayonets into the ground? I deliberately use this expression which, in the Kerensky period, I personally, and all our comrades, constantly used in resolutions, speeches and newspaper articles. We said: The war cannot be brought to a close by the men sticking their bayonets into the ground. If there are Tolstoyans

who think otherwise, they must be pitied as people who have taken leave of their senses, and you can expect nothing better from them.

We said that emergence from this war may involve us in a revolutionary war. We said this from 1915 onwards, and then later, in the Kerensky period. Of course, revolutionary war is also war, just as arduous, sanguinary and painful. And when the revolution develops on a world scale it inevitably arouses resistance on the same world scale. The situation now being such that all the civilised countries in the world are fighting against Russia, we must not be surprised that extremely ignorant peasants are accusing us of failing to keep our promises. Nothing else is to be expected from them. In view of their absolute ignorance, we cannot blame them. Indeed, how can you expect a very ignorant peasant to understand that there are different kinds of wars, that there are just and unjust wars, progressive and reactionary wars, wars waged by advanced classes and wars waged by backward classes, wars waged for the purpose of perpetuating class oppression and wars waged for the purpose of eliminating oppression? To understand this one must be familiar with the class struggle, with the principles of socialism, and at least a little bit familiar with the history of revolution. You cannot expect this from an ignorant peasant.

But when a man who calls himself a democrat, or a socialist, gets up on a platform to make a public statement—irrespective of what he calls himself, Menshevik, Social-Democrat, Socialist-Revolutionary, true socialist, adherent of the Berne International, there are lots of titles of this sort, titles are cheap—when such an individual gets up and charges us with having promised peace and called forth war, what answer should be made to him? Are we to assume that he is as ignorant as the ignorant peasant who cannot distinguish one kind of war from another? Are we to assume that he does not see the difference between the imperialist war, which was a predatory war, and which has now been utterly exposed as such—since the Treaty of Versailles only those who are totally incapable of reasoning and thinking, or who are totally blind, can fail to see that it was a predatory war on both sides—are we to assume that there is even

one literate person who fails to see the difference between that predatory war and the war we are waging and which is assuming world-wide dimensions, because the world bourgeoisie have realised that they must fight their last decisive battle? We cannot assume any of this. And that is why we say that anybody who claims to be a democrat, or a socialist, of whatever shade, is a supporter of the bourgeoisie if he in one way or another, directly or indirectly, spreads among the people the accusation that the Bolsheviks are dragging out the Civil War, which is an arduous and painful war, whereas they promised peace; and this is how we shall answer him, and we shall take our stand against him just as we do against Kolchak. Such is our answer. Such is the entire issue.

The gentlemen of *Dyelo Naroda* express astonishment and say: "But we are opposed to Kolchak; what terrible injustice to persecute us!"

It is a great pity, gentlemen, that you refuse to be logical and do not wish to understand the simple ABC of politics from which certain definite deductions must be made. You say that you are opposed to Kolchak. I take up the newspapers *Vsegda Vperyod!* and *Dyelo Naroda* and read the philistine arguments of this type, these moods that are so numerous and that prevail among the intelligentsia. I say that every one of you who spreads such accusations among the people is supporting Kolchak, because he does not understand the elementary, fundamental difference, which every literate person sees, between the imperialist war which we smashed, and the Civil War in which we have become involved. We never concealed from the people the fact that we were taking this risk. We are straining every nerve to defeat the bourgeoisie in this Civil War and to prevent all possibility of class oppression. There has never been, nor can there ever be, a revolution that was guaranteed against a long and arduous struggle, and perhaps filled with the most desperate sacrifices. Those who are unable to distinguish between the sacrifices made in the course of a revolutionary struggle for the sake of its victory, when all the propertied, all the counter-revolutionary classes are fighting against the revolution, those who cannot distinguish between these sacrifices and the sacrifices involved

in a predatory war waged by the exploiters, are either abysmally ignorant—and such people ought to be made to learn their ABC, before giving them adult education they ought to be given the most elementary education—or they are out-and-out Kolchak-supporting hypocrites, whatever they may call themselves, or under whichever title they may try to disguise themselves. And these accusations against the Bolsheviks are the most common and widespread. They are really linked up with the broad masses of the working people, because the ignorant peasants find it difficult to understand; they suffer from all war, no matter what the war is about. I am not surprised when I hear an ignorant peasant say: "We had to fight for the tsar, we fought for the Mensheviks, and now we have to fight for the Bolsheviks." This does not surprise me. Indeed, war is war, and entails endless heavy sacrifices. "The tsar said that it was a war for freedom and liberation from a yoke; the Mensheviks said that it was a war for freedom and liberation from a yoke. And now the Bolsheviks say the same thing. They all say the same thing; how can we sort this all out?"

Indeed, how can an ignorant peasant sort it all out? Such a man still has to learn elementary politics. But what can we say about a man who uses such words as "revolution", "democracy", and "socialism", and claims that these words should be used with understanding. He cannot juggle with such words unless he wants to be a political faker, for the difference between a war between two groups of robbers and a war waged by an oppressed class which has risen in revolt against all robbery is an elementary, radical and fundamental difference. The issue is not one of a certain party, class or government justifying war—the real point at issue is the nature of the war, its class content, which class is waging it, and what policy is embodied in it.

II

I shall now leave the question of appraising the arduous and difficult period we are now passing through, and which is inevitably connected with the revolution, for another political issue, which also comes up in all debates, and also gives rise to confusion. This is the question of a bloc

with the imperialists, of an alliance, an agreement with the imperialists.

Probably you have read in the newspapers the names of the Socialist-Revolutionaries Volsky and, I believe, Svyatitsky, who recently wrote in *Izvestia*, and issued their manifesto. They regard themselves as Socialist-Revolutionaries who cannot possibly be accused of having supported Kolchak. They left Kolchak, they suffered at the hands of Kolchak, and on coming over to us they rendered us a service against Kolchak. That is true. But examine the arguments these citizens advance. See how they appraise the question of a bloc with the imperialists, of an alliance, or agreement, with the imperialists. I had occasion to read their arguments when the authorities combating counter-revolution confiscated their writings, and when I had to examine their papers to be able to judge correctly the extent of their association with Kolchak. These are undoubtedly the best of the Socialist-Revolutionaries. In their writings I found the following argument, "What do you mean? You want us to repent; you are waiting for us to repent. Never! We have nothing to repent of! You accuse us of having entered into a bloc, an agreement with the Entente, with the imperialists. But did you Bolsheviks not enter into an agreement with the German imperialists? What is the Brest peace? Is not the Brest peace an agreement with imperialism? You entered into an agreement with German imperialism at Brest; we entered into an agreement with French imperialism; we are quits, we have nothing to repent of!"

This argument, which I found in the writings of the persons I have mentioned and of their colleagues, is one that I also find when I call to mind the newspapers I mentioned and when I try to sum up my impressions of philistine conversations. We constantly hear arguments of this kind, it is one of the chief political arguments we have to deal with. I therefore ask you to examine and analyse this argument, and to study it theoretically. What does it amount to? Are those right who say: "We democrats and socialists were in a bloc with the Entente; you were in a bloc with Wilhelm, you concluded the Brest peace. We have no grounds for mutual reproach. We are quits"? Or are we

right when we say that those who not merely in words but in deeds are in agreement with the Entente against the Bolshevik revolution are supporters of Kolchak? Although they may deny it a thousand times, although they have personally deserted Kolchak and have proclaimed to the whole people that they are opposed to him, their very roots, the whole nature and significance of their arguments and their deeds make them Kolchak supporters. Who is right? This is the fundamental question of the revolution; and some thought must be given to this.

To explain this point, permit me to draw another analogy, this time, however, not with an individual revolutionary, but with an individual man in the street. Let us suppose that you were riding in an automobile and suddenly your car is surrounded by bandits who point a revolver at your head. Let us suppose that after this you surrender your money and weapons to the bandits, and even let them take the car and ride off. Well? You have given the bandits weapons and money. That is a fact. Now let us suppose that another citizen gave these bandits weapons and money so as to take part in their attacks on peaceful citizens.

In both cases an agreement is reached, whether written or verbal makes no difference. We can picture to ourselves a man giving up his revolver, his weapons and his money, without uttering a word. The nature of the agreement is clear: "I give you my revolver, my weapons and money, and you give me the opportunity to rid myself of your pleasant company." (*Laughter.*) The agreement is a fact. It is also possible for a tacit agreement to be concluded by the man who gives the bandits weapons and money to enable them to rob other people and afterwards give him part of the loot. This, too, is a tacit agreement.

Now I ask you, could any literate person fail to distinguish between these two agreements? You will say that if a man is unable to distinguish between these two agreements and says, "You gave the bandits money and weapons and so don't accuse other people of banditism; what right have you to accuse other people of banditism?"—such a man must be a cretin. If you were to meet such a literate person you would have to admit, or at least 999 out of 1,000 would admit, that he had taken leave of his senses,

and that it is useless to discuss political, or even criminal, subjects with such a man.

I now ask you to carry your thoughts from this example to the comparison between the Brest peace and the agreement with the Entente. What was the Brest peace? Was it not an act of violence on the part of bandits who had attacked us when we were honestly proposing peace and were calling upon all nations to overthrow *their own* bourgeoisie? It would have been ridiculous had we started by trying to overthrow the German bourgeoisie! We denounced this treaty before the whole world as a most predatory, plundering treaty, we condemned it and at first even refused to sign it, as we counted on the assistance of the German workers. But when the robbers put a revolver to our heads, we said, take the weapons and the money, we will settle accounts with you later on by other means. We know that German imperialism has another enemy, whom blind people have not noticed, namely, the German workers. Can this agreement with imperialism be put on a par with the agreement entered into by democrats, socialists and Socialist-Revolutionaries—don't laugh, the more radical the title the more resonant it sounds—with the agreement they entered into with the Entente to fight against the workers of their own country? But that is what they did, and are doing to this day. The most influential Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, those with European reputations, are living abroad even today, and they are in alliance with the Entente. I do not know whether this is a written agreement; probably not, clever people do such things on the quiet. But it is obvious that such an agreement exists, since they are being made such a fuss of, are given passports, and wireless messages are being sent all over the world stating that Axelrod delivered a speech today, that Savinkov, or Avksentyev, will deliver a speech tomorrow, and that Breshkovskaya will speak the day after tomorrow. Is this not an agreement, even if a tacit one? But is it the same kind of agreement with the imperialists as we concluded? Outwardly it resembles ours as much as the act of a man who gives weapons and money to bandits resembles any act of this nature, irrespective of its object and character, at all events, irrespective of the

object for which I give the bandits money and weapons: whether it is to get rid of them when they attack me and I find myself in a position where if I do not give them my revolver they will kill me; or I give the bandits money and weapons for the purpose of robbery, of which I am aware, and in the proceeds of which I am to share.

"I, of course, call this liberating Russia from the dictatorship of tyrants. I, of course, am a democrat, because I support the famous Siberian or Archangel democracy, and am fighting, of course, for a Constituent Assembly. Don't dare to suspect that I am pursuing some evil object. And even if I am rendering assistance to those bandits, the British, French and American imperialists, I am doing so only in the interests of democracy, of the Constituent Assembly, of government by the people, of the unity of the working classes of the population, and in order to overthrow those tyrants and usurpers, the Bolsheviks!"

Noble aims, no doubt. But has not everybody who engages in politics heard that politics are not judged by bare statements but by real class content? Which class do you serve? If you are in agreement with the imperialists, are you participating in imperialist banditism or not?

In my "Letter to American Workers", I spoke, among other things, about the American revolutionary people fighting to liberate themselves from England in the eighteenth century, when they were waging one of the first and greatest wars for real liberation in human history, one of the few really revolutionary wars in human history—and this great revolutionary American people, in fighting for their liberation, entered into agreements with the bandits of Spanish and French imperialism, who at that time had colonies in neighbouring parts of America. In alliance with these bandits, the American people fought the English and liberated themselves from them. Have you ever met any literate person anywhere in the world, have you seen any socialists, Socialist-Revolutionaries, representatives of democracy, or whatever it is they call themselves—even the Mensheviks—have you ever heard that any of these have the temerity publicly to blame the American people for this, to say that they violated the principle of democracy, freedom, and so forth? Such a crank has not yet been born.

But today, we get people here who call themselves by these titles, and even claim a right to belong to the same International that we belong to, and say that it is merely a piece of Bolshevik mischievousness—and everybody knows that the Bolsheviks are mischievous—to organise their own International and refuse to join the good, old, common to all, united, Berne International!

And there are people who say: "We have nothing to repent of. You entered into an agreement with Wilhelm, we entered into an agreement with the Entente, we are quits!"

I say that if these people have even an elementary knowledge of politics they are Kolchak supporters, no matter how much they personally may have denied this, no matter how much they personally are sick and tired of Kolchak, no matter how much they have suffered at his hands and in spite of their having come over to our side. They are Kolchak supporters because it is impossible to imagine that they do not see the difference between an agreement one is compelled to make in the course of the struggle against the exploiters—and which the exploited classes have been compelled to make over and over again throughout the history of the revolution—and the conduct of our most influential alleged democrats, representatives of our "socialist" intelligentsia, some of whom yesterday and some today entered into agreements with the bandits and robbers of international imperialism against a *section*—as they say—a section of the working classes of their own country. These are Kolchak people, and the only relations possible with them are those between conscious revolutionaries and Kolchak supporters.

III

I now come to the next question, that of our attitude towards democracy in general.

I have already said that the democrats and socialists plead democracy as the most common justification, the most common defence of the political stand taken against us. The most emphatic supporter of this point of view in European literature is, as you, of course, know, Kautsky,

the ideological leader of the Second International, and to this day a member of the Berne International. "The Bolsheviks have chosen a method which violates democracy; the Bolsheviks have chosen the method of dictatorship. Hence, their cause is unjust," he says. This argument has been repeated a thousand and a million times, it occurs constantly in all periodicals, including the newspapers I have mentioned. It is being constantly repeated by all intellectuals, and sometimes the ordinary man in the street sub-consciously repeats it in his arguments. "Democracy means freedom, it means equality, it means settling questions by a majority. What can be higher than freedom, equality, and majority decisions? Since you Bolsheviks have departed from this, and even have the presumption to say publicly that you stand above freedom, equality and majority decisions, you must not be surprised, nor must you complain, when we call you usurpers and tyrants!"

We are not in the least surprised at this, for what we desire most of all is clarity; and the only thing we rely on is that the advanced section of the working people should really be conscious of its position. Yes, we said, and say it all the time in our programme, in the programme of our Party, that we shall not allow ourselves to be deceived by such high-sounding slogans as freedom, equality and the will of the majority, and that we shall treat as aiders and abettors of Kolchak those who call themselves democrats, adherents of pure democracy, adherents of consistent democracy and who, directly or indirectly, oppose it to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Get this clear—you must get it clear. Are the pure democrats guilty of merely preaching pure democracy, defending it from the usurpers, or are they guilty of being on the side of the propertied classes, on the side of Kolchak?

We shall begin our examination with the question of freedom. Needless to say, for every revolution, socialist or democratic, freedom is a very, very important slogan. But our programme says that if freedom runs counter to the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital, it is a deception. And every one of you who has read Marx—and, I think, even every one who has read at least one popular exposition of Marx's theories—knows that Marx

devoted the greater part of his life, the greater part of his literary work, and the greater part of his scientific studies to ridiculing freedom, equality, the will of the majority, and all the Benthamites who wrote so beautifully about these things, and to proving that these phrases were merely a screen to cover up the freedom of the commodity owners, the freedom of capital, which these owners use to oppress the masses of the working people.

At the present time, when things have reached the stage of overthrowing the rule of capital all over the world, or at all events in one country; in this historical epoch, when the struggle of the oppressed working people for the complete overthrow of capital and the abolition of commodity production stands in the forefront, we say that all those who in such a political situation talk about "freedom in general", who in the name of this freedom oppose the dictatorship of the proletariat are doing nothing more nor less than aiding and abetting the exploiters, for unless freedom promotes the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital, it is a deception, as we openly say in our Party programme. Perhaps this is superfluous from the point of view of the outward structure of the programme, but it is most fundamental from the point of view of our propaganda and agitation, from the point of view of the principle of the proletarian struggle and proletarian power. We know perfectly well that we have to contend against world capital; we know perfectly well that at one time it was the task of world capital to create freedom, that it overthrew feudal slavery, that it created bourgeois freedom. We know perfectly well that this was epoch-making progress. And yet we say that we are opposing capitalism in general, republican capitalism, democratic capitalism, free capitalism; and, of course, we know that it will raise the standard of liberty against us. But to this we have our answer, and we deemed it necessary to give this answer in our programme—all freedom is deception if it runs counter to the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital.

But, perhaps, this is not the case? Perhaps there is no contradiction between freedom and the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital? Take the West-European countries that you have visited, or at least have read about.

Every book you read describes their system as the freest system. And now, these civilised countries of Western Europe—France and Britain—and America have raised this standard, are marching against the Bolsheviks “in the name of freedom”. Only the other day—we now get French newspapers but rarely because we are completely surrounded, but we do get wireless information, because, after all, they cannot blockade the air, and we intercept foreign wireless messages—the other day I had the opportunity of reading a wireless message that was sent out by the predatory government of France to the effect that in fighting the Bolsheviks and supporting their opponents, France was remaining true to her “lofty ideals of freedom”. We hear this sort of thing at every step, it is the general tone of their polemics against us.

But what do they mean by freedom? By freedom these civilised Frenchmen, Englishmen and Americans mean, say, freedom of assembly. The constitution should contain the clause: “Freedom of assembly for all citizens.” “This,” they say, “is the substance, this is the principal manifestation of freedom. But you Bolsheviks have violated freedom of assembly.”

To this we answer indeed, the freedom that you British, French and American gentlemen preach is a deception if it runs counter to the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital. You have forgotten a detail, you civilised gentlemen. You have forgotten that your freedom is inscribed in a constitution which *sanctions private property*. That is the whole point.

In your constitution you have freedom side by side with private property. The fact that you recognise freedom of assembly, of course, marks vast progress compared with the feudal system, with medievalism, with serfdom. All socialists admitted this when they took advantage of the freedom of bourgeois society to teach the proletariat how to throw off the yoke of capitalism.

But your freedom is only freedom on paper, but not in fact. By that I mean that the large halls that are to be found in big cities—like this hall, for example—belong to the capitalists and landowners, and are sometimes called “Assembly Rooms for the Gentry”. You may freely assemble

in these halls, citizens of the Russian Democratic Republic, but remember that they are private property and, pardon me for saying so, you must respect private property, otherwise you will be Bolsheviks, criminals, murderers, robbers and mischief-makers. But we say: "We shall change all this. We shall first convert these Assembly Rooms into premises for workers' organisations and then begin to talk about freedom of assembly." You accuse us of violating freedom. But we say that all freedom is deception if it is not subordinated to the task of emancipating labour from the yoke of capital. The freedom of assembly inscribed in the constitutions of all bourgeois republics is a deception because in order to assemble in a civilised country, which after all has not abolished winter, has not changed its climate, it is necessary to have premises in which to assemble, and the best of these premises are private property. First, we shall confiscate the best premises and then begin to talk about freedom.

We say that to grant freedom of assembly to the capitalists would be a heinous crime against the working people; it would mean freedom of assembly for counter-revolutionaries. We say to the bourgeois intellectual gentlemen, to the gentlemen who advocate democracy—you lie when you throw in our face the accusation of violating freedom. When your great bourgeois revolutionaries made a revolution in England in 1649, and in France in 1792-93, they did not grant freedom of assembly to the royalists. The French revolution is called great because it did not suffer from the flabbiness, half-heartedness and phrasemongering which distinguished many of the revolutions of 1848, but was an effective revolution which, after overthrowing the royalists, completely crushed them. And we shall do the same thing with the capitalist gentlemen; for we know that in order to emancipate the working people from the yoke of capital we must deprive the capitalists of freedom of assembly; their "freedom" must be abolished, or curtailed. This will help to emancipate labour from the yoke of capital; it will help the cause of that true freedom under which there will be no buildings inhabited by single families, and which belong to private individuals, such as landowners, capitalists, or to joint-stock companies.

When that time comes, when people have forgotten that it was possible for public buildings to be somebody's property, we shall be in favour of complete "freedom". When the world is inhabited only by those who work, and when people have forgotten that it was possible for idlers to have been members of society—this will not be very soon, and the bourgeois and bourgeois intellectual gentlemen are to blame for the delay—we shall then be in favour of freedom of assembly for all. At the present time, however, freedom of assembly would mean freedom of assembly for the capitalists, for counter-revolutionaries. We are fighting against them, we are resisting them, and we say that we deprive them of this freedom.

We are marching into battle—this is the meaning of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Gone is the time of naïve, utopian, fantastic, mechanical and intellectual socialism, when people imagined that it was sufficient to convince the majority, that it was sufficient to paint a beautiful picture of socialist society to persuade the majority to adopt socialism. Gone, too, is the time when it was possible to entertain oneself and others with these children's fairy-tales. Marxism, which recognises the necessity for the class struggle, asserts that mankind can reach the goal of socialism only through the dictatorship of the proletariat. The word dictatorship is a cruel, stern, bloody and painful one; it is not a word to play with. Socialists advance this slogan because they know that the exploiters will surrender only after a desperate and relentless struggle, and that they will try to cover up their own rule by means of all sorts of high-sounding words.

Freedom of assembly—what can be loftier, what can be finer than this term? Is the development of the working people and of their mentality conceivable without freedom of assembly? Are the principles of humanity conceivable without freedom of assembly? But we say that the freedom of assembly inscribed in the constitution of Great Britain and the United States of America is a deception because it ties the hands of the masses of the working people during the whole period of their transition to socialism; it is a deception because we know perfectly well that the bourgeoisie will do all in their power to overthrow this new

government, which is so unusual, and which seems so "monstrous" at first. Those who have thought about the class struggle and have anything like a clear and definite idea of the relations between the workers in revolt and the bourgeoisie, who have been overthrown in one country, but have not yet been overthrown in all countries, and who, because they have not been overthrown everywhere, are rushing into the struggle with greater ferocity than ever, will agree that it cannot be otherwise.

It is precisely after the bourgeoisie is overthrown that the class struggle assumes its acutest forms. And we have no use for those democrats and socialists who deceive themselves and deceive others by saying: "The bourgeoisie have been overthrown, the struggle is all over." The struggle is not over, it has only just started, because, to this day, the bourgeoisie have not reconciled themselves to the idea that they have been overthrown. On the eve of the October Revolution they were very nice and polite, and Milyukov, Chernov and the *Novaya Zhizn* people said jestingly: "Now, please, Bolshevik gentlemen, form a Cabinet, take power yourselves for a few weeks, that would be a great help to us!" This is exactly what Chernov wrote on behalf of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, what Milyukov wrote in *Rech*, and what the semi-Menshevik *Novaya Zhizn* wrote. They spoke in jest because they did not take matters seriously. But now they see that matters are serious, and the British, French and Swiss bourgeoisie, who thought that their "democratic republics" were armour which protected them, see and realise that matters have become serious, and now they are all arming. If only you could see what is going on in free Switzerland, how, literally, every bourgeois is arming, how they are forming a White Guard, because they know that it is now a matter of preserving the privileges which enable them to keep millions of people in a state of wage-slavery. The struggle has now assumed world-wide dimensions, and therefore, anybody who opposes us with such catchwords as "democracy", and "freedom", takes the side of the propertied classes, deceives the people, for he fails to understand that up to now freedom and democracy have meant freedom and democracy for the propertied classes and only crumbs from their table for the propertyless.

What is freedom of assembly when the working people are crushed by slavery to capital and by toil for the benefit of capital? It is a deception; and in order to achieve freedom for the working people it is first of all necessary to overcome the resistance of the exploiters, and since I am faced with the resistance of a whole class, it is obvious that I cannot promise this class either freedom, equality, or majority decisions.

IV

I shall now pass from freedom to equality. This is a much more profound subject. This brings us to a still more serious, a more painful question, one that gives rise to considerable disagreement.

The revolution in its course sweeps away one exploiting class after another. First, it swept away the monarchy, and by equality implied an elected government, a republic. Proceeding further it swept away the landowners; and you know that the keynote of the entire struggle against the medieval system, against feudalism, was the slogan "equality". All are equal irrespective of social-estate; all are equal, millionaires and paupers alike. This is what the great revolutionaries of the period that has gone into history as the period of the great French Revolution said, thought and sincerely believed. The slogan of the revolution against the landowners was equality, and by equality was meant that the millionaires and the workers should have equal rights. The revolution developed. It said that "equality"—we did not specify this in our programme, for one cannot go on repeating the same thing endlessly; it is as clear as what we said about freedom—that equality is a deception if it runs counter to the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital. That is what we say, and it is absolutely true. We say that a democratic republic with present-day equality is a fraud, a deception; here there is no equality, nor can there be. It is prevented by the private ownership of the means of production and money, capital. It is possible, at one stroke, to confiscate privately-owned mansions and fine buildings, it is possible in a relatively short period to confiscate capital and the means

of production. But try to abolish the private ownership of money.

Money is congealed social wealth, congealed social labour. Money is a token which enables its owner to take tribute from all the working people. Money is a survival of yesterday's exploitation. That is what money is. Can it be abolished at one stroke? No. Even before the socialist revolution the socialists wrote that it is impossible to abolish money at one stroke, and our experience corroborates this. There must be very considerable technical and, what is much more difficult and much more important, organisational achievement before we can abolish money; and until then we must put up with equality in words, in the constitution; we must put up with a situation in which everybody who possesses money practically has the right to exploit. We could not abolish money at one stroke. We say that for the time being money will remain, and remain for a fairly long time in the transition period from the old capitalist system to the new socialist system. Equality is a deception if it runs counter to the emancipation of labour from the yoke of capital.

Engels was a thousand times right when he said that the concept of equality is a most absurd and stupid prejudice *if it does not imply* the abolition of classes.⁶⁰ Bourgeois professors attempted to use the concept equality as grounds for accusing us of wanting all men to be alike. They themselves invented this absurdity and wanted to ascribe it to the socialists. But in their ignorance they did not know that the socialists—and precisely the founders of modern scientific socialism, Marx and Engels—had said: equality is an empty phrase if it does not imply the abolition of classes. We want to abolish classes, and in this sense we are for equality. But the claim that we want all men to be alike is just nonsense, the silly invention of an intellectual who sometimes conscientiously strikes a pose, juggles with words, but says nothing—I don't care whether he calls himself a writer, a scholar, or anything else.

But we say that our goal is equality, and by that we mean the abolition of classes. Then the class distinction between workers and peasants should be abolished. That is exactly our object. A society in which the class distinction

between workers and peasants still exists is neither a communist society nor a socialist society. True, if the word socialism is interpreted in a certain sense, it might be called a socialist society, but that would be mere sophistry, an argument about words. Socialism is the first stage of communism; but it is not worth while arguing about words. One thing is clear, and that is, that as long as the class distinction between workers and peasants exists, it is no use talking about equality, unless we want to bring grist to the mill of the bourgeoisie. The peasantry constitute a class of the patriarchal era, a class which has been reared by decades and centuries of slavery; and throughout all these decades the peasants existed as *small proprietors*, first, under the heel of other classes, and later, formally free and equal, but as *property-owners and the owners of food products*.

This brings us to the question which most of all rouses the ire of our enemies, which most of all creates doubt in the minds of inexperienced and thoughtless people, and which separates us most of all from those would-be democrats and socialists who are offended because we do not recognise them as such, but call them supporters of the capitalists, perhaps due to their ignorance, but supporters of the capitalists all the same.

Their social conditions, production, living and economic conditions make the peasant half worker and half huckster.

This is a fact. And you cannot get away from this fact until you have abolished money, until you have abolished exchange. And for this years and years of the stable rule by the proletariat is needed; for only the proletariat is capable of vanquishing the bourgeoisie. We are told: "You are violators of equality, you have violated equality not only with the exploiters—'with this I am inclined to agree', some Socialist-Revolutionary or Menshevik who does not know what he is talking about may say—but you have violated equality between the workers and the peasants, you have violated the equality of 'labour democracy', you are criminals!" In answer to this we say: "Yes, we have violated equality between the workers and peasants, and we assert that you who stand for this equality are supporters of Kolchak." Recently I read a splendid article

by Comrade Germanov, in *Pravda*, in which he deals with the theses drawn up by Citizen Sher, one of the most "socialistic" of the Menshevik Social-Democrats. These theses were submitted to one of our co-operative organisations, and they are of such a nature that they deserve to be engraved on a tablet and hung up in every volost executive committee with an inscription underneath stating: "This is Kolchak's man."

I know perfectly well that Citizen Sher and his friends will call me a slanderer for this, and perhaps something worse. Nevertheless, I invite those people who have learned the ABC of political economy and of politics to make a very careful study to see who is right and who is wrong. Citizen Sher says that the Soviet government's food policy, and its economic policy in general, is all wrong; that it is necessary, gradually at first, and then to an increasing degree, to grant freedom to trade in food products, and to safeguard private property.

I say that this is Kolchak's economic programme, his economic basis. I assert that anybody who has read Marx, especially the first chapter of *Capital*, anybody who has read at least Kautsky's popular outline of Marx's theories entitled *The Economic Theories of Karl Marx*, must come to the conclusion that in the midst of a proletarian revolution against the bourgeoisie, at a time when landowner and capitalist property is being abolished, when the country that has been ruined by four years of imperialist war is starving, freedom to trade in grain would mean freedom for the capitalists, freedom to restore the rule of capital. This is Kolchak's economic programme, for Kolchak does not rest on air.

It is rather silly to denounce Kolchak only because of the atrocities he committed against the workers, or even because he flogged schoolmistresses for sympathising with the Bolsheviks. This is a vulgar defence of democracy, a silly accusation against Kolchak. Kolchak operates with the means he has at hand. But what is his economic basis? His basis is freedom of trade. This is what he stands for; and *this is why* all the capitalists support him. But you say: "I have left Kolchak, I do not support him." This stands to your credit, of course; but it does not prove that

you have a head on your shoulders and are able to think. This is the answer we give to these people, without casting any slur on the honour of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks who deserted Kolchak when they realised that he is a tyrant. But if such people, in a country which is fighting a desperate struggle against Kolchak, continue to fight for the "equality of labour democracy", for freedom to trade in grain, they are still supporting Kolchak, the only trouble being that they do not understand this and cannot reason logically.

Kolchak—it does not matter whether his name is Kolchak or Denikin, their uniforms may be different, but their natures are the same—is able to hold out because, having captured a region rich in grain, he grants freedom to trade in grain and permits the *free restoration of capitalism*. This was the case in all revolutions, and this will be the case in this country if we abandon the dictatorship of the proletariat for the sake of the "freedom" and "equality" of the democratic, Socialist-Revolutionary, Left-Menshevik and other gentlemen, sometimes including the anarchists—the number of titles is infinite. In the Ukraine at the present time, every gang chooses a political title, each more free and democratic than the other, and there is a gang to every uyezd.

The "advocates of the interests of the working peasantry", mainly the Socialist-Revolutionaries, propose equality between the workers and the peasants. Others, like Citizen Sher, have studied Marxism, but they still do not understand that there can be no equality between the workers and the peasants in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, and that those who promise this should be regarded as advocating Kolchak's programme, even if they do so unwittingly. I assert that anybody who gives some thought to the actual conditions prevailing in this completely ruined country will understand this.

The "socialists" who assert that in this country we are in the period of the bourgeois revolution, constantly accuse us of having introduced "consumers'" communism. Some of them say it is communism for soldiers, and imagine that they are superior to this, imagine that they have risen above this "base" form of communism. But these are simply

people who juggle with words. They have seen books, studied books, repeat what is in books, but they understand nothing about what the books say. There are scholars, and even very learned scholars, like that. They have read in books that socialism represents the highest development of production. Kautsky does nothing else but repeat this sort of thing even now. The other day I read in a German newspaper, which got here by accident, a report of the last Congress of Workers' Councils in Germany. Kautsky was one of the *rapporteurs* at this Congress, and in his report he emphasised—not he personally, but his wife; he was sick, and so his wife read the report—in this report he emphasised that socialism represents the highest development of production, that without production neither capitalism nor socialism was possible, and that this the German workers did not understand.

Poor German workers! They are fighting Scheidemann and Noske, fighting against the butchers, striving to overthrow the power of Scheidemann and Noske, the butchers who continue to call themselves Social-Democrats, and they think civil war is going on! Liebknecht was murdered, and so was Rosa Luxemburg. All the Russian bourgeois say—and this was stated in an Ekaterinodar newspaper: "This is what ought to be done to our Bolsheviks!" This is exactly what this paper stated. Those who understand what is going on know perfectly well that this is the opinion of the entire world bourgeoisie. We must defend ourselves. Scheidemann and Noske are waging civil war against the proletariat. War is war. The German workers think that they are in a state of civil war and all other questions are of minor importance. The first task is to feed the workers. Kautsky thinks that this is "soldiers" or "consumers" communism, and that it is necessary to develop production!...

Oh, how clever you are, gentlemen! But how can production be developed in a country that is being plundered and ruined by the imperialists, and which lacks coal, raw materials and machinery? "Develop production!" There is not a meeting of the Council of People's Commissars, or of the Council of Defence that does not share out the last millions of poods of coal or oil, and find ourselves in a terrible fix when the commissars take the last scraps and

even then no one has enough, and we have to decide which factory to close down, in which place to leave the workers without work—a painful question, but one we are compelled to decide because we have no coal. The coal is in the Donets Basin; the coal has been destroyed by the German invaders. This is a typical state of affairs. Take Belgium or Poland. The same thing is happening everywhere as a consequence of the imperialist war. Hence, unemployment and starvation are likely to last many years, for some flooded mines take many years to restore. And yet we are told that socialism means increasing output. You have read books, good, kind gentlemen, you have written books, but you don't understand a scrap of what is in the books. (*Applause.*)

Of course, if it were a case of capitalist society in peacetime, peacefully developing into socialism, there would be no more urgent task before us than that of increasing output. But the little word "if" makes all the difference. *If* only socialism had come into being peacefully, in the way the capitalist gentlemen did not want to see it born. But there was a slight hitch. Even if there had been no war, the capitalist gentlemen would have done all in their power to prevent such a peaceful evolution. Great revolutions, even when they commence peacefully, as was the case with the great French Revolution, end in furious wars which are instigated by the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. Nor can it be otherwise, if we look at it from the point of view of the class struggle and not from the point of view of philistine phrase-mongering about liberty, equality, labour democracy and the will of the majority, of all the dull-witted, philistine phrase-mongering to which the Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries and all these "democrats" treat us. There can be no peaceful evolution towards socialism. In the present period, after the imperialist war, it is ridiculous to expect peaceful evolution, especially in a ruined country. Take France. France is one of the victors, and yet the production of grain there has dropped to half. In Britain they are saying that they are now paupers—I read this in an English bourgeois newspaper. And yet the Communists in a ruined country are blamed because industry is at a standstill! Whoever says this is either an utter idiot—

even if he thrice calls himself a leader of the Berne International—or else a traitor to the workers.

The primary task in a ruined country is to save the working people. The primary productive force of human society as a whole, is the workers, the working people. If they survive, we shall save and restore everything.

We shall have to put up with many years of poverty, retrogression to barbarism. The imperialist war has thrown us back to barbarism; but if we save the working people, if we save the primary productive force of human society—the workers—we shall recover everything, but if we fail to save them, we shall perish, so that those who are now shouting about “consumers”, or “soldiers”, communism, who look down upon others with contempt and imagine that they are superior to these Bolshevik Communists, are, I repeat, absolutely ignorant of political economy, and pick out passages from books like a scholar whose head is a card index box filled with quotations from books, which he picks out as he needs them; but if a new situation arises which is not described in any book, he becomes confused and grabs the wrong quotation from the box.

At the present time, when the country is ruined, our main and fundamental task is to save the lives of the workers, *to save the workers*, for the workers are dying because the factories are at a standstill, and the factories are at a standstill because there is no fuel, and because our production is all artificial, industry is isolated from raw material sources. It is the same thing all over the world. Raw materials for the Russian cotton mills must be transported from Egypt, America, or the nearer Turkestan. Try to obtain these when the counter-revolutionary gangs and the British forces have captured Ashkhabad and Krasnovodsk. Try to obtain them from Egypt or America when the railways lie in ruins, when they are at a standstill because there is no coal.

We must save the workers even if they are unable to work. If we keep them alive for the next few years we shall save the country, save society and socialism. If we don't, we shall slip back into wage-slavery. This is how things stand with the socialism that springs not from the imagination of a peaceful simpleton who calls himself a Social-Democrat, but from actual reality, from the fierce, desper-

ately fierce class struggle. This is a fact. We must sacrifice everything to save the lives of the workers. And in the light of this, when people come to us and say they are in favour of the equality of labour democracy, whereas the Communists do not even allow equality between the workers and peasants, our answer is: the workers and peasants are equal as working people, but the well-fed grain profiteer is not the equal of the hungry worker. This is the only reason why our Constitution says that the workers and peasants are not equal.

Do you say that they ought to be equal? Let us weigh and count it up. Take sixty peasants and ten workers. The sixty peasants possess surplus stocks of grain. They are clothed in rags, but they have bread. Take the ten workers. After the imperialist war they, too, are in rags, but they are also exhausted, they have no bread, fuel or raw materials. The factories are idle. Well, are they equal? Should the sixty peasants have the right to decide and the ten workers be obliged to obey? The great principle of equality, unity of labour democracy and deciding by a majority vote!

That is what they tell us. And we tell them that they are mere clowns who confuse the hunger problem and obscure it with their high-sounding phrases.

We ask you whether the workers in a ruined country where the factories are idle ought to submit to the decision of the majority of peasants when the latter refuse to deliver their surplus stocks of grain. Have they the right to take these surplus stocks, by force, if necessary, if there is no other way? Give us a straightforward answer! But when we get right down to brass tacks they begin to twist and wriggle.

Industry is ruined in all countries, and it will remain in that state for several years, because it is easy to set fire to factories or to flood mines, it is easy to blow up railway wagons and to wreck locomotives—any fool can do that, even if he calls himself a German or French officer, and is very efficient, especially when he has good instruments for causing explosions, good fire-arms, and so forth. But it is a very difficult matter to restore it all. That will take years.

The peasantry constitute a special class. As working people they are hostile to capitalist exploitation; but at

the same time they are property-owners. For centuries the peasant has been brought up to believe that the grain is his and he is at liberty to sell it. "This is my right," each one thinks, "because it is the fruit of my labour, my sweat and blood." This mentality cannot be changed overnight. It can be changed only as a result of a long and stern struggle. Whoever imagines that socialism can be achieved by one person convincing another, and that one a third, is at best an infant, or else a political hypocrite; and, of course, the majority of those who speak on political platforms belong to the latter category.

The whole point is that the peasants are accustomed to having the right to trade in grain. After we had abolished the capitalist institutions we found that there was still another force which kept capitalism going—the force of habit. And the more resolutely we abolished the institutions on which capitalism was based, the more strongly we felt the effects of this other force on which capitalism was based—the force of habit. Under favourable circumstances, institutions can be smashed at one stroke; but habit, never, no matter how favourable circumstances may be. Although we have given all the land to the peasants, have liberated them from landed proprietorship, and have swept away everything that held them in bondage, they nevertheless continue to think that "freedom" means freedom to trade in grain; and they regard as tyranny the compulsory surrendering of surplus stocks of grain at fixed prices. Why, what do you mean by "surrender"? they ask indignantly, especially since our grain supply apparatus is still defective because the entire bourgeois intelligentsia is on the side of Sukharevka.⁶¹ Naturally, this machinery has to rely on people who are only just learning, at best—if they are conscientious and devoted to their task—will learn their business in a few years, and until that time the machinery will be defective, and sometimes all sorts of rascals who call themselves Communists will find their way into it. This danger threatens every ruling party, the victorious proletariat of every country, for it is impossible either to break the resistance of the bourgeoisie or to build up efficient machinery overnight. We know perfectly well that the machinery of the Commissariat of Food is still bad. Re-

cently a scientific statistical investigation was made into the food conditions of the workers in the non-agricultural gubernias. The investigation showed that the workers obtain half their food from the Commissariat of Food and the other half from the profiteers; for the first half they pay one-tenth of their total expenditure on food, and for the other half they pay nine-tenths.

The first half of the food supplies, collected and delivered by the Commissariat of Food, is badly collected, of course, but it is collected on socialist and not on capitalist lines. It is collected by defeating the profiteers, and not by compromising with them; it is collected by sacrificing all other interests in the world, including the interests of the formal "equality" which the Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries and Co. make so much fuss about, to the interests of the starving workers. You keep your "equality", gentlemen, and we shall keep our hungry workers we have saved from starvation. No matter how much the Mensheviks may accuse us of violating "equality", the fact is that we have solved half our food problem in spite of unprecedented and incredible difficulties. And we say that if sixty peasants have surplus stocks of grain and ten workers are starving, we must not talk about "equality" in general, or about "the equality of working people", but say that it is the bounden duty of the sixty peasants to submit to the decisions of the ten workers and to give them, or at least to loan them, their surplus stocks of grain.

The science of political economy, if anybody has learned anything from it, the history of revolution, the history of political evolution throughout the whole of the nineteenth century show that the peasants follow the lead of either the workers or the bourgeoisie. Nor can they do otherwise. Some democrats may, of course, take exception to this, others may think that, being a malicious Marxist, I am slandering the peasants. They say the peasants constitute the majority, they are working people, and yet cannot follow their own road. Why?

If you don't know why, I would say to such citizens, read the elements of Marx's political economy in Kautsky's popular exposition, think about the evolution of any of the great revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centu-

ries, about the political history of any country in the nineteenth century, and you will learn why. The economics of capitalist society are such that the ruling power can be only capital or the proletariat which has overthrown capital.

There are no other forces in the economics of this society.

A peasant is half worker and half huckster. He is a worker because he earns his bread by the sweat of his brow and is exploited by the landowners, capitalists and merchants. He is a huckster because he sells grain, an article of necessity, an article for which a man will give up all his possessions if there is a shortage of it. Hunger is no man's friend. People will pay a thousand rubles, any sum of money, will give up all their property, for bread.

The peasant cannot be blamed for this; he is living under a commodity economy and has been for scores and hundreds of years, and is accustomed to exchange grain for money. You cannot change a habit or abolish money overnight. To abolish money you must organise the distribution of products for hundreds of millions of people, and this is something that must take many years. And so, as long as the commodity system exists, as long as there are starving workers side by side with well-fed peasants who are concealing their surplus stocks of grain, the antagonism of workers' and peasants' interests will persist. And whoever attempts to use phrases like "freedom", "equality" and "labour democracy" to brush aside this real antagonism created by the actual state of affairs, is at best a mere phrase-monger, and at worst a hypocritical champion of capitalism. If capitalism defeats the revolution it will do so by taking advantage of the ignorance of the peasants, by bribing them and luring them with the prospect of a return to freedom of trade. Actually, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries side with capitalism against socialism.

The economic programme of Kolchak, Denikin and all the Russian whiteguards is freedom to trade. They understand this, and it is not their fault that Citizen Sher does not. The economic facts of life do not change because a certain party does not understand them. The slogan of the bourgeoisie is freedom to trade. Efforts are made to beguile the peasants by asking them whether it would not be better

to live in the good old way? Whether it would not be better to live freely by the free sale of the fruits of farm labour? What could be fairer? This is what those who consciously support Kolchak say, and they are right from the point of view of the interests of capital. To restore the power of capital in Russia it is necessary to rely on tradition—on the prejudices of the peasants as against their common sense, on their old habits of trading on the open market, and it is necessary forcibly to crush the resistance of the workers. There is no other way. The Kolchaks are right from the point of view of capital; their economic and political programme ties up neatly, there are no loose ends; they know there is a connection between freedom for peasants to trade and shooting down the workers. They are connected even though Citizen Sher is unaware of it. Freedom to trade in grain is the economic programme of Kolchak; the shooting of tens of thousands of workers—as occurred in Finland—is a necessary means of realising this programme, because the workers will not voluntarily surrender their gains. The connection cannot be broken, yet the Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionaries, who are totally ignorant of economic science and politics, who, being terrified philistines, have forgotten the ABC of socialism, are trying to make us forget this connection by talking about “equality” and “freedom”, by shouting about our violating the principle of equality of “labour democracy” and saying that our Constitution is “unfair”.

The vote of one worker is equal to several peasant votes. Is that unfair?

No, in the period when it is necessary to overthrow capital it is quite fair. I know where you have borrowed your conception of fairness from; you have borrowed it from yesterday's capitalist era. The equality, the freedom of commodity owners—that is your conception of fairness. A petty-bourgeois survival of petty-bourgeois prejudices—that is what your fairness, your equality, your labour democracy amount to. We, however, subordinate fairness to the interests of defeating capital. And capital can be defeated only by the united efforts of the proletariat.

Can tens of millions of peasants be firmly united against capital, against freedom of trade, overnight? No, economic

conditions would prevent it even if the peasants were quite free and much more cultured. It cannot be done because different economic conditions and long years of preparation are needed for this. And who will make these preparations? Either the proletariat or the bourgeoisie.

Owing to their economic status in bourgeois society the peasants must follow either the workers or the bourgeoisie. *There is no middle way.* They may waver, become confused, conjure up all sorts of things; they may blame, swear, curse the "bigoted" representatives of the proletariat and the "bigoted" representatives of the bourgeoisie and say that they are the minority. You may curse them, talk loud about the majority, about the broad universal character of your labour democracy, about pure democracy. There is no end to the number of words you can string together, but they will only serve to obscure the fact that if the peasants do not follow the lead of the workers they will follow the lead of the bourgeoisie. There is not, nor can there be, a middle course. And those people who in this most difficult period of transition in history, when the workers are hungry and their industry is at a standstill, *do not help the workers* to take grain at a fairer *but not a "free" price*, not at a capitalist, hucksters' price, are carrying out the Kolchak programme no matter how much they may deny this to themselves, and no matter how sincerely they may be convinced that they are carrying out their own programme conscientiously.

V

I will now deal with the last question on my list, that of the defeat and victory of the revolution. Kautsky, whom I mentioned to you as the chief representative of the old, decayed socialism, does not understand the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He reproached us, saying that a decision taken by a majority might have ensured a peaceful issue. A decision by a dictatorship is a decision taken by military means. Hence, if you do not win by force of arms you will be vanquished and annihilated, because in civil war no prisoners are taken, it is a war of extermination. This is how terrified Kautsky tried to "terrify" us.

Quite right. What you say is true. We confirm the correctness of your observation and there is nothing more to be said. Civil war is more stern and cruel than any other war. This has been the case throughout history since the time of the civil wars in ancient Rome; wars between nations always ended in a deal between the propertied classes, and only during civil war does the oppressed class exert efforts to exterminate the oppressing class, to eliminate the economic conditions of this class's existence.

I ask you, what is the "revolutionary" worth who tries to scare those who have started the revolution with the prospect that it might suffer defeat? There has never been, there is none, there will not be, nor can there be a revolution which did not stand some risk of defeat. A revolution is a desperate struggle of classes that has reached the peak of ferocity. The class struggle is inevitable. One must either reject revolution altogether or accept the fact that the struggle against the propertied classes will be sterner than all other revolutions. Among socialists who are at all intelligent there was never any difference of opinion on this point. A year ago, when I analysed the apostasy that lay behind Kautsky's statements I wrote the following. Even if—this was in September last year—even if the imperialists were to overthrow the Bolshevik government tomorrow we would not for a moment repent that we had taken power. And not a single class-conscious worker who represents the interests of the masses of the working people would repent, or have any doubt that, in spite of it all, our revolution had triumphed; the revolution triumphs if it brings to the forefront the advanced class which strikes effectively at exploitation. Under such circumstances, the revolution triumphs even if it suffered defeat. This may sound like juggling with words; but to prove the truth of it, let us take a concrete example from history.

Take the great French Revolution. It is with good reason that it is called a great revolution. It did so much for the class that it served, for the bourgeoisie, that it left its imprint on the entire nineteenth century, the century which gave civilisation and culture to the whole of mankind. The great French revolutionaries served the interests of the bourgeoisie although they did not realise it for their

vision was obscured by the words "liberty, equality and fraternity"; in the nineteenth century, however, what they had begun was continued, carried out piecemeal and finished in all parts of the world.

In a matter of eighteen months our revolution has done ever so much more for our class, the class we serve, the proletariat, than the great French revolutionaries did.

They held out in their own country for two years, and then perished under the blows of united European reaction, under the blows of the united hordes of the whole world, who crushed the French revolutionaries, reinstated the legitimate monarch in France, the Romanov of the period, reinstated the landowners, and for many decades later crushed every revolutionary movement in France. Nevertheless, the great French Revolution triumphed.

Everybody who studies history seriously will admit that although it was crushed, the French Revolution was nevertheless triumphant, because it laid down for the whole world such firm foundations of bourgeois democracy, of bourgeois freedom, that they could never be uprooted.

In a matter of eighteen months our revolution has done ever so much more for the proletariat, for the class which we serve, for the goal towards which we are striving—the overthrow of the rule of capital—than the French Revolution did for its class. And that is why we say that even if we take the hypothetically possible worst contingency, even if tomorrow some lucky Kolchak were to exterminate the Bolsheviks to the last man, the revolution would still be invincible. And what we say is proved by the fact that the new type of state organisation produced by this revolution has achieved a moral victory among the working class all over the world and is already receiving its support. When the prominent French bourgeois revolutionaries perished in the struggle they were isolated, they were not supported in other countries. All the European states turned against them, chief among them England, although it was an advanced country. After only eighteen months of Bolshevik rule, our revolution succeeded in making the new state organisation which it created, the Soviet organisation, comprehensible, familiar and popular to the workers all over the world, in making them regard it as their own.

I have shown you that the dictatorship of the proletariat is an inevitable, essential and absolutely indispensable means of emerging from the capitalist system. Dictatorship does not mean only force, although it is impossible without force, but also a form of the organisation of labour superior to the preceding form. That is why in my brief speech of greeting at the opening of the Congress I emphasised this fundamental, elementary and extremely simple task of *organisation*; and that is why I am so strongly opposed to all these intellectual fads and "proletarian cultures". As opposed to these fads I advocate the ABC of organisation. Distribute grain and coal in such a way as to take care of every pood—this is the object of proletarian discipline. Proletarian discipline is not discipline maintained by the lash, as it was under the rule of the serf-owners, or discipline maintained by starvation, as it is under the rule of the capitalists, but comradely discipline, the discipline of the labour unions. If you solve this elementary and extremely simple problem of organisation, we shall win, for then the peasants—who vacillate between the workers and the capitalists, who cannot make up their minds whether to side with the people of whom they are still suspicious, but cannot deny that these people are creating a more just organisation of production under which there will be no exploitation, and under which "freedom" of trade in grain will be a crime against the state, who cannot make up their minds whether to side with these people or with those who, as in the good old days, promise freedom to trade which is alleged to mean also freedom to work in any way one pleased—the peasants, I say, will whole-heartedly side with us. When the peasants see that the proletariat is organising its state power in such a way as to maintain order—and the peasants want this and demand it, and they are right in doing so, although this desire for order is connected with much that is confused and reactionary, and with many prejudices—they, in the long run, after considerable vacillation, will follow the lead of the workers. The peasants cannot simply and easily pass from the old society to the new overnight. They are aware that the old society ensured "order" by ruining the working people and making slaves of them. But they are not sure that the proletariat can guarantee order.

More cannot be expected of these downtrodden, ignorant and disunited peasants. They will not believe words and programmes. And they are quite right not to believe words, for otherwise there would be no end to frauds of every kind. They will believe only deeds, practical experience. Prove to them that you, the united proletariat, the proletarian state, the proletarian dictatorship, are able to distribute grain and coal in such a way as to husband every pood, that you are able to arrange matters so that every pood of surplus grain and coal is distributed not by the profiteers, shall not profit the heroes of Sukharevka, but shall be fairly distributed, supplied to starving workers, even to sustain them during periods of unemployment when the factories and workshops are idle. Prove that you can do this. This is the fundamental task of proletarian culture, of proletarian organisation. Force can be used even if those who resort to it have no economic roots, but in that case, history will doom it to failure. But force can be applied with the backing of the advanced class, relying on the loftier principles of the socialist system, order and organisation. *In that case, it may suffer temporary failure, but in the long run it is invincible.*

If the proletarian organisation proves to the peasants that it can maintain proper order, that labour and bread are fairly distributed and that care is being taken to husband every pood of grain and coal, that we workers are able to do this with the aid of our comrades, trade union discipline, that we resort to force in our struggle only to protect the interests of labour, that we take grain from profiteers and not from working people, that we want to reach an understanding with the middle peasants, the working peasants, and that we are ready to provide them with all we can at present—when the peasants see all this, their alliance with the working class, their alliance with the proletariat, will be indestructible. And this is what we aim at.

But I have digressed somewhat from my subject and must return to it. Today, in all countries, the word "Bolshevik" and the word "Soviet" have ceased to be regarded as queer terms, as they were only recently, like the word "Boxer", which we repeated without understanding what it meant. The word "Bolshevik" and the word "Soviet" are now being repeated in all the languages of the world. Every day the

class-conscious workers see that the bourgeoisie of all countries release a flood of lies about Soviet power in the millions of copies of their newspapers, but they learn from this vituperation. Recently I read some American newspapers. I read the speech of a certain American parson who said that the Bolsheviks were immoral, that they had nationalised women, that they are robbers and plunderers. And I also read the reply of the American Socialists. They are distributing at five cents a copy the Constitution of the Soviet Republic of Russia, of this "dictatorship", which does not provide "equality of labour democracy". They reply by quoting a clause of the Constitution of these "usurpers", "robbers" and "tyrants" who disrupt the unity of labour democracy. Incidentally, in welcoming Breshkovskaya on the day she arrived in America, the leading capitalist newspaper in New York carried a headline in letters a yard long stating: "Welcome, Granny!" The American Socialists reprinted this and wrote: "She is in favour of political democracy—is there anything surprising, American workers, in the fact that the capitalists praise her?" She stands for political democracy. Why should they praise her? Because she is opposed to the Soviet Constitution. "Well," said the American Socialists, "here is a clause from the Constitution of these robbers." And they always quote the same clause which says that those who exploit the labour of others shall not have the right to elect or be elected. This clause from our Constitution is known all over the world. And it is because Soviet power frankly states that all must be subordinated to the dictatorship of the proletariat, that it is a new type of state organisation—it is precisely for this reason that it has won the sympathies of the workers all over the world. This new state organisation is being born in travail because it is far more difficult, a million times more difficult, to overcome our disruptive, petty-bourgeois laxity than to suppress the tyrannical landowners or the tyrannical capitalists, but the effort bears a million times more fruit in creating the new organisation which knows no exploitation. When proletarian organisation solves this problem, socialism will triumph completely. And it is to this that you must devote all your activities both in the schools and in the field of adult education. Notwithstanding

the extremely difficult conditions that prevail, and the fact that the first socialist revolution in history is taking place in a country with a very low level of culture, notwithstanding this, Soviet power has already won the recognition of the workers of other countries. The phrase "dictatorship of the proletariat" is a Latin phrase, and the working people who heard it for the first time did not know what it meant, and did not know how it could be instituted. Now this Latin phrase has been translated into the modern languages and we have shown that the dictatorship of the proletariat is Soviet power, the government under which the workers organise themselves and say that their organisation is superior to every other. No idler, no exploiter can belong to this organisation. This organisation has but one object, and that is, to overthrow capitalism. No false slogans, no fetishes like "freedom", and "equality", will deceive us. We recognise no freedom, no equality, no labour democracy if it conflicts with the cause of emancipating labour from the yoke of capital. This is what we incorporated in the Soviet Constitution, and we have already won for it the sympathies of the workers of all countries. They know that in spite of the difficulty with which the new order is being born, and in spite of the severe trials and even defeats which may fall to the lot of some of the Soviet republics, no power on earth can compel mankind to turn back. (*Stormy applause.*)

**FOREWORD TO THE PUBLISHED SPEECH
"DECEPTION OF THE PEOPLE
WITH SLOGANS OF FREEDOM AND EQUALITY"**

The question I dealt with in my speech at the Congress on adult education on May 19—the question of equality in general and the equality of the worker and the peasant in particular—is undoubtedly one of the most pressing and “painful” questions of our time, and one that touches upon the most deep-seated prejudices of the petty bourgeois, the small proprietor, the petty commodity owner, every philistine and nine-tenths of the intelligentsia (including the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary intelligentsia).

Deny the equality of the worker and the peasant! How terrible! Of course, this is something all the friends of the capitalists, all of their hangers-on, and the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries first of all, are trying to seize upon in order to “irritate” the peasant, to “stir him up”, to incite him against the workers, against the Communists. Such attempts are inevitable, but since they are founded on lies, they are doomed to disgraceful failure.

Peasants are sober-minded, business-like, practical people. Things must be explained to them in a practical light, through simple, everyday examples. Is the peasant who has a surplus of grain justified in hiding this surplus until prices reach exorbitant, profiteering levels, without any regard for the workers who are going hungry? Or is the state authority, which is in the hands of the workers, justified in taking over all surplus grain not at profiteering, huckstering, exorbitant prices, but at a fixed price set by the state?

That is the point at issue. That is the whole thing in a nutshell. To avoid facing up to this fact the various swind-

lers who, like the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, are working for the capitalists, for the return of undivided power to them, are resorting to empty phrase-mongering about "equality" and the "unity of labour democracy".

The peasant must make his choice:

either freedom to trade in grain, which means speculation in grain, freedom for the rich to grow richer, freedom for the poor to be pauperised and to starve, return of undivided power to the landowners and capitalists, dissolution of the alliance of the peasants and the workers,

or delivery of grain surpluses at a fixed price to the state, i.e., the united workers' authority, which means an alliance between the peasants and the workers to get rid of the bourgeoisie altogether and to eliminate any possibility of their rule being restored.

Such is the choice.

The richer peasants, the kulaks, will choose the first alternative; they will want to try their luck in alliance with the capitalists and landowners against the workers, against the poor, but such peasants are a minority in Russia. The majority of the peasants will prefer an alliance with the workers against the restoration of capitalist rule, against "freedom for the rich to grow richer", against "freedom for the poor to starve", against the deceitful camouflage of this accursed capitalist "freedom" (freedom to starve to death) with flowery words about "equality" (the equality of the well-fed, who have a surplus of grain, and the starving).

Our task is to fight the cunning capitalist deception which the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries practise by means of resounding and flowery phrase-mongering about "freedom" and "equality".

Peasants! Unmask the wolves in sheep's clothing who praise "freedom", "equality", and "unity of labour democracy" and thereby actually champion the "freedom" of the landowner to oppress the peasants, the "equality" of the wealthy capitalist and the worker or the semi-starved peasant, the "equality" of the well-fed man who hides his surplus grain and the worker who is tormented by hunger and unemployment because the country has been ruined by war. Such wolves in sheep's clothing are the working people's worst enemies; whether they call themselves Mensheviks,

Socialist-Revolutionaries, or non-party they are in reality friends of the capitalists.

"The workers and peasants are equal as working people, but the well-fed grain profiteer is not the equal of the hungry worker." "We are fighting only to protect the interests of labour, we take grain from profiteers, and not from working people." "We want to reach an understanding with the middle peasants, the working peasants"—this is what I said in my speech, this is the *crux* of the matter, this is the real truth which is confused by loud-sounding phrases about "equality". Moreover, the vast majority of the peasants know that this is the truth, that the *workers' state* fights the profiteers and the rich while rendering every assistance to the working people and the poor, whereas *both the landowner state* (under a monarchy) *and the capitalist state* (under the freest and most democratic republic) have always and everywhere, in all countries, *helped the rich to rob the working people, helped the speculators and the rich to grow richer at the expense of the poor who become poorer.*

This is a truth every peasant knows. And hence the greater their awareness, the sooner and more resolutely the majority of the peasants will make their choice and declare for alliance with the workers, for agreement with the workers' government, against the landowner or capitalist state; for Soviet power against the "Constituent Assembly" or the "democratic republic"; for agreement with the Bolshevik Communists, against any support for the capitalists, Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries!

* * *

To the "learned" gentlemen, to the democrats, socialists, Social-Democrats, Socialist-Revolutionaries, etc., we say: you all pay lip-service to the "class struggle", but actually you close your eyes to it at the very time when it is growing especially acute. And to do that means to side with capital, with the bourgeoisie, against the working people.

He who recognises the class struggle must also recognise that in a bourgeois republic, even in the freest and most democratic bourgeois republic, "freedom" and "equality" never were, and never could be, anything but an expression

of the equality and freedom of the *commodity owners*, the equality and freedom of *capital*. Marx, in all of his writings and especially in his *Capital* (which you all recognise in words), made this clear thousands of times; he ridiculed the abstract conception of "freedom and equality" and the vulgarisers, the Benthamites who closed their eyes to the facts, and he revealed the material roots of these abstractions.

Under the bourgeois system (i.e., as long as private property in land and in the means of production persists) and under bourgeois democracy, "freedom and equality" remain purely formal, signifying in practice *wage-slavery* for the workers (who are formally free and equal) and the *undivided rule of capital*, the oppression of labour by capital. This is the ABC of socialism, my learned gentlemen—and you have forgotten it.

It follows from this ABC that during the proletarian revolution, when the class struggle has sharpened to the point of civil war, only fools and traitors will seek to get away with empty talk about "freedom", "equality" and "unity of labour democracy". Actually everything depends on the outcome of the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and the intermediate, middle classes (including the entire petty bourgeoisie, and hence the entire peasantry) inevitably vacillate between the two camps.

The issue is this—which of the main forces, the proletariat or the bourgeoisie, these intermediate sections will join. There *cannot be* any third way; he who has not understood this from reading Marx's *Capital* has understood nothing in Marx, understood nothing in socialism, but is in fact a philistine and a petty bourgeois who blindly follows in the wake of the bourgeoisie. On the other hand, he who has understood all this, will not allow himself to be deceived by empty phrases about "freedom" and "equality", but will think and speak of *practical things*, that is, of the concrete conditions for a *rapprochement* between the peasants and the workers, their *alliance* against the capitalists, *agreement* between them against the exploiters, the rich and the profiteers.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is not the end of class struggle but its continuation in new forms. The dictatorship of the proletariat is class struggle waged by a proletariat

that is victorious and has taken political power into its hands against a bourgeoisie that has been defeated but not destroyed, a bourgeoisie that has not vanished, not ceased to offer resistance, but that has intensified its resistance. The dictatorship of the proletariat is a specific form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the working people, and the numerous non-proletarian strata of the working people (petty bourgeoisie, small proprietors, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, etc.), or the majority of these strata, an alliance against capital, an alliance whose aim is the complete overthrow of capital, complete suppression of the resistance offered by the bourgeoisie as well as of attempts at restoration on its part, an alliance for the final establishment and consolidation of socialism. It is a specific kind of alliance which takes shape in a specific situation, namely, amidst fierce civil war; it is an alliance between firm supporters of socialism and its vacillating allies, sometimes "neutrals" (in which case instead of an agreement on struggle the alliance becomes an agreement on neutrality); an alliance between economically, politically, socially, and spiritually different classes. Only the corrupt heroes of the corrupt Berne or yellow International, people like Kautsky, Martov and Co., can evade examination of the concrete forms, conditions, and tasks of this alliance by resorting to platitudes about "freedom", "equality", and "unity of labour democracy", that is, by snatching fragments from the ideological baggage of the era of commodity economy.

N. Lenin

June 23, 1919

Published in the pamphlet:
N. Lenin, *Two Speeches at
the First All-Russia Congress
on Adult Education*,
Moscow, 1919

Published according to
the pamphlet

**TELEGRAM
TO THE COUNCIL OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARS
OF THE UKRAINE**

Kiev

The Central Committee of the Party has discussed the critical situation, the almost catastrophic situation, in the Donets Basin and on the Manych, and proposes urgently that the Kiev Council of Defence bend all efforts to accelerate and step up military aid to the Donets Basin, appoint a number of the best comrades to exercise daily, unflagging supervision over the fulfilment of these measures and, especially, carry out the immediate universal mobilisation of the workers of Odessa, Ekaterinoslav, Nikolayev, Kharkov and Sevastopol as reinforcements for the Southern Front; lastly, make Podvoisky and Antonov personally responsible for the Makhno group. Bear in mind that the defeat of the revolution is inevitable unless Rostov is speedily captured.

On behalf of the C.C.,

Lenin, Stalin

Written May, 8, 1919

Published according
to the manuscript

ADDENDUM TO THE DRAFT APPEAL TO GERMAN WORKERS AND TO PEASANTS WHO DO NOT EXPLOIT THE LABOUR OF OTHERS

Proletarians throughout the world are showing increasing sympathy for Soviet power and there is a growing conviction that only Soviet power, the power of the working people, and not bourgeois parliamentarism, even in the most democratic republic, is capable of emancipating labour from the yoke of capital, the nations from enmity and wars, and mankind from the lawlessness of savage imperialism.

This conviction will break a road for itself, cost what it may. In all countries the workers are becoming convinced that they cannot save themselves from imperialism and wars unless they break with the bourgeoisie, unless they defeat them and overthrow their power, unless they ruthlessly suppress the resistance of the exploiters. A beginning can be made only in one's own country. The Russian Soviet system has met with the sympathy of the working masses throughout the world, and everyone except the exploiters and their lackeys now sees that Soviet power is the one hope of deliverance; this is because we Russian workers and peasants have earned their confidence by having broken with the bourgeoisie, overthrown them and suppressed their resistance, because we have driven out of the ranks of the working people those leaders of traitor-socialism who, like the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, entered into a direct and indirect alliance with the imperialist bourgeoisie, with Kerensky, etc.

As long as the German workers tolerate a government of such traitors to socialism, scoundrels and bourgeois lackeys as the Scheidemanns and all their party there will be no

question of saving the German people; the German people will remain the actual slaves of the bourgeoisie and will be *accomplices* in their crimes—all the “socialist platitudes” and all the “democratic” and “republican” rhetoric notwithstanding—in the same way as the “socialists” of the Entente who are at present members of the Berne yellow International and who answer the atrocities of the Entente with hypocritical well-wishing, kindly empty phrases or compliments paid to Wilson, etc., still remain traitors to socialism, scoundrels and accomplices in the atrocities and crimes of the French, British and American bourgeoisie.

It is inevitable that the German workers will break with the traitors to socialism, the Scheidemanns and their party. It is inevitable that they will break with the senility, hesitancy, lack of ideology and character of the so-called Independents who were dependent on the Scheidemanns yesterday and who today depend on their fear of going over resolutely to the side of Soviet power. The bourgeoisie may slaughter hundreds of leaders and thousands of workers but they are powerless to prevent this break-away.

Published according to
the manuscript

TELEGRAM TO J. V. STALIN⁹²

Stalin,
Smolny,
Petrograd

May 20, 1919

Have received both notes. Have made detailed arrangements with Sklyansky for unflagging supervision over fulfilment. I hope that the universal mobilisation of Petrograd men will be followed by their attack and not by sitting in barracks.

Lenin

Published according to
the manuscript

**SPEECH AT THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY
TRAINING FESTIVAL
MAY 25, 1919⁶³**

BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

Today we are celebrating the universal military training of the working people.

Up to now, matters military have been an instrument of the exploitation of the proletariat by the capitalists and landowners. And to this day capitalists all over Europe are holding out with the aid of the remnants of their old armies, commanded by bourgeois officers. But this most reliable prop of the bourgeoisie will collapse when the workers take up the rifle, when they begin to form their own, vast proletarian army, when they begin to train soldiers who know what they are fighting for, who will defend the workers and peasants, their factories and workshops, and prevent the landowners and capitalists from coming back to power.

Today's festival demonstrates the successes we have achieved, the new force that is springing up from the working class. This parade convinces us that Soviet power has won the sympathies of the workers of all countries, that the fraternal alliance of world Soviet republics will take the place of world wars.

Permit me to introduce to you a Hungarian comrade, Tibor Szamuely, Commissar for Military Affairs of the Hungarian Soviet Republic.

Long live the Hungarian proletariat!

Long live the world communist revolution!

GREETINGS TO THE HUNGARIAN WORKERS

Comrades, the news we have been receiving from the Hungarian Soviet leaders fills us with enthusiasm and pleasure. Soviet government has been in existence in Hungary for only a little over two months, yet as regards organisation the Hungarian proletariat already seems to have excelled us. That is understandable, for in Hungary the general cultural level of the population is higher; furthermore, the proportion of industrial workers to the total population is immeasurably greater (in Budapest there are three million of the eight million population of present-day Hungary), and, lastly, in Hungary the transition to the Soviet system, to the dictatorship of the proletariat, has been incomparably easier and more peaceful.

This last circumstance is particularly important. The majority of the European socialist leaders, of both the social-chauvinist and Kautskyite trends, have become so much a prey to purely philistine prejudices, fostered by decades of relatively "peaceful" capitalism and the bourgeois-parliamentary system, that they are unable to understand what Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat mean. The proletariat cannot perform its epoch-making liberating mission unless it removes these leaders from its path, unless it sweeps them out of its way. These people believed, or half-believed, the bourgeois lies about Soviet power in Russia and were unable to distinguish the nature of the new, proletarian democracy—democracy for the working people, socialist democracy, as embodied in Soviet government—from bourgeois democracy, which they slavishly worship and call "pure democracy" or "democracy" in general.

These blind people, fettered by bourgeois prejudices, failed to understand the epoch-making change from bourgeois to proletarian democracy, from bourgeois to proletarian dictatorship. They confused certain specific features of Russian Soviet government, of the history of its development in Russia, with Soviet government as an international phenomenon.

The Hungarian proletarian revolution is helping even the blind to see. The form of transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat in Hungary is altogether different from that in Russia—voluntary resignation of the bourgeois government, instantaneous restoration of working-class unity, socialist unity *on a communist programme*. The nature of Soviet power is now all the clearer; the only form of rule which has the support of the working people and of the proletariat at their head that is now possible anywhere in the world is Soviet rule, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This dictatorship presupposes the ruthlessly severe, swift and resolute use of force to crush the resistance of the exploiters, the capitalists, landowners and their underlings. Whoever does not understand this is not a revolutionary, and must be removed from the post of leader or adviser of the proletariat.

But the essence of proletarian dictatorship is not in force alone, or even mainly in force. Its chief feature is the organisation and discipline of the advanced contingent of the working people, of their vanguard; of their sole leader, the proletariat, whose object is to build socialism, abolish the division of society into classes, make all members of society working people, and remove the basis for all exploitation of man by man. This object cannot be achieved at one stroke. It requires a fairly long period of transition from capitalism to socialism, because the reorganisation of production is a difficult matter, because radical changes in all spheres of life need time, and because the enormous force of habit of running things in a petty-bourgeois and bourgeois way can only be overcome by a long and stubborn struggle. That is why Marx spoke of an entire period of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the period of transition from capitalism to socialism.⁶⁴

Throughout the whole of this transition period, resistance to the revolution will be offered both by the capitalists and by their numerous myrmidons among the bourgeois intellectuals, who will resist consciously, and by the vast mass of the working people, including the peasants, who are shackled very much by petty-bourgeois habits and traditions, and who all too often will resist unconsciously. Vacillations among these groups are inevitable. As a working man the peasant gravitates towards socialism, and prefers the dictatorship of the workers to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. As a seller of grain, the peasant gravitates towards the bourgeoisie, towards freedom of trade, i.e., back to the "habitual", old, "time-hallowed" capitalism.

What is needed to enable the proletariat *to lead* the peasants and the petty-bourgeois groups in general is the dictatorship of the proletariat, the rule of one class, its strength of organisation and discipline, its centralised power based on all the achievements of the culture, science and technology of capitalism, its proletarian affinity to the mentality of every working man, its prestige with the disunited, less developed working people in the countryside or in petty industry, who are less firm in politics. Here phrase-mongering about "democracy" in general, about "unity" or the "unity of labour democracy", about the "equality" of all "men of labour", and so on and so forth—the phrase-mongering for which the now petty-bourgeois social-chauvinists and Kautskyites have such a predilection — is of no use whatever. Phrase-mongering only throws dust in the eyes, blinds the mind and strengthens the old stupidity, conservatism, and routine of capitalism, the parliamentary system and bourgeois democracy.

The abolition of classes requires a long, difficult and stubborn *class struggle*, which, *after* the overthrow of capitalist rule, *after* the destruction of the bourgeois state, *after* the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, *does not disappear* (as the vulgar representatives of the old socialism and the old Social-Democracy imagine), but merely changes its forms and in many respects becomes fiercer.

The proletariat, by means of a class struggle against the resistance of the bourgeoisie, against the conservatism, routine, irresolution and vacillation of the petty bourgeoisie,

must uphold its power, strengthen its organising influence, "neutralise" those groups which fear to leave the bourgeoisie and which follow the proletariat too hesitantly, and consolidate the new discipline, the comradely discipline of the working people, their firm bond with the proletariat, their unity with the proletariat—that new discipline, that new basis of social ties in place of the serf discipline of the Middle Ages and the discipline of starvation, the discipline of "free" wage-slavery under capitalism.

In order to abolish classes a period of the dictatorship of one class is needed, the dictatorship of precisely that oppressed class which is capable not only of overthrowing the exploiters, not only of ruthlessly crushing their resistance, but also of breaking ideologically with the entire bourgeois-democratic outlook, with all the philistine phrase-mongering about liberty and equality in general (in reality, this phrase-mongering implies, as Marx demonstrated long ago, the "liberty and equality" of *commodity owners*, the "liberty and equality" of *the capitalist and the worker*).

More, classes can be abolished only by the dictatorship of that oppressed class which has been schooled, united, trained and steeled by decades of the strike and political struggle against capital—of that class alone which has assimilated all the urban, industrial, big-capitalist culture and has the determination and ability to protect it and to preserve and further develop all its achievements, and make them available to all the people, to all the working people—of that class alone which will be able to bear all the hardships, trials, privations and great sacrifices which history inevitably imposes upon those who break with the past and boldly hew a road for themselves to a new future—of that class alone whose finest members are full of hatred and contempt for everything petty-bourgeois and philistine, for the qualities that flourish so profusely among the petty bourgeoisie, the minor employees and the "intellectuals"—of that class alone which "has been through the hardening school of labour" and is able to inspire respect for its efficiency in every working person and every honest man.

Hungarian workers! Comrades! You have set the world an even better example than Soviet Russia by your ability to unite all socialists at one stroke on the platform of genuine

proletarian dictatorship. You are now faced with the most gratifying and most difficult task of holding your own in a rigorous war against the Entente. Be firm. Should vacillation manifest itself among the socialists who yesterday gave their support to you, to the dictatorship of the proletariat, or among the petty bourgeoisie, suppress it ruthlessly. In war the coward's legitimate fate is the bullet.

You are waging the only legitimate, just and truly revolutionary war, a war of the oppressed against the oppressors, a war of the working people against the exploiters, a war for the victory of socialism. All honest members of the working class all over the world are on your side. Every month brings the world proletarian revolution nearer.

Be firm! Victory will be yours!

May 27, 1919

Lenin

Pravda No. 115,
May 29, 1919

Published according
to the manuscript

THE HEROES OF THE BERNE INTERNATIONAL

In my article, "The Third International and Its Place in History" (*The Communist International*⁶⁵ No. 1, May 1, 1919, p. 38 of the Russian edition) I pointed to one of the outstanding symptoms of the ideological bankruptcy of members of the old, putrid, Berne International. This bankruptcy of the theoreticians of the reactionary socialism which did not understand the dictatorship of the proletariat found expression in the proposal made by the German "independent" Social-Democrats to join, unite, combine the bourgeois parliament with a form of Soviet power.

Kautsky, Hilferding, Otto Bauer and Co., the most outstanding theoreticians of the old International, did not realise that they were proposing to combine the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the dictatorship of the proletariat! The men who made names for themselves and won the sympathies of the workers by their advocacy of the class struggle and by the proofs they advanced of its necessity, failed to realise—at the crucial moment of the struggle for socialism—that they were betraying the whole doctrine of the class struggle, were renouncing it completely and actually deserting to the camp of the bourgeoisie by their attempt to combine the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the dictatorship of the proletariat. This sounds incredible, but it is a fact.

By way of a rare exception, we have managed to receive in Moscow a fairly large number of foreign newspapers, although not of consecutive dates, so that we are now able to retrace in greater detail—although not in complete detail, of course—the history of the vacillation of those gentlemen, the "Independents", on the most important theoretical and

practical question of the present day. This is the question of the relation between dictatorship (*of the proletariat*) and democracy (*bourgeois*), or between Soviet power and bourgeois parliamentarism.

In his pamphlet *Die Diktatur des Proletariats* (Wien, 1918) Herr Kautsky wrote that "the Soviet form of organisation is one of the most important phenomena of our time. It promises to acquire decisive importance in the great decisive battles between capital and labour towards which we are marching" (p. 33 of Kautsky's pamphlet). And he added that the Bolsheviks made a mistake in converting the Soviets from "a *combat organisation of one class*" into "a *state organisation*" and thereby "destroying democracy" (*ibid.*).

In my pamphlet *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* (Petrograd and Moscow, 1918) I examined this argument of Kautsky's in detail and showed him to be completely oblivious of the fundamental tenets of Marxism on the state; for the state (every state, including the most democratic republic) is nothing more nor less than a machine in the hands of one class for the suppression of another. To describe the Soviets as the combat organisation of a *class*, and deny them the right to convert themselves into a "state organisation", is *actually* tantamount to renouncing the ABC of socialism, proclaiming, or advocating, that the *bourgeois machine for the suppression of the proletariat* (*that is*, the bourgeois-democratic republic, the bourgeois state) should remain inviolate; it is actual desertion to the camp of the bourgeoisie.

The absurdity of Kautsky's position is so glaring, the pressure exerted by the masses of the workers who are demanding Soviet power is so strong, that Kautsky and his followers have been obliged to make an ignominious retreat; they have got themselves into a muddle, for they lack the courage honestly to admit their mistake.

On February 9, 1919, *Freiheit* (Freedom), the organ of the "Independent" (of Marxism, but absolutely dependent on petty-bourgeois democracy) Social-Democrats of Germany, contained an article by Herr Hilferding. In this article the author is *already* demanding that the Workers' Councils should be converted into a state organisation, but that they should exist *side by side with* the bourgeois parlia-

ment, the National Assembly, and together with it. On February 11, 1919, in an appeal to the German proletariat, this slogan was accepted by the *entire* Independent Party (and consequently, also by Herr Kautsky, who thereby contradicted the statements he had made in the autumn of 1918).

This attempt to combine the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the dictatorship of the proletariat is a complete renunciation of Marxism and of socialism in general; forgotten are the experiences of the Russian Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries who from May 6, 1917 to October 25, 1917 (old style) made the "experiment" of combining the Soviets as a "state organisation" with the *bourgeois* state and failed ignominiously.

At the Party Congress of the Independents (held at the beginning of March 1919) the entire Party accepted this supremely sagacious proposal to combine Workers' Councils with bourgeois parliamentarism. But *Freiheit* No. 178, of April 13, 1919 (Supplement) reported that the "Independent" group at the Second Congress of Workers' Councils had proposed the following resolution:

"The Second Congress of Workers' Councils takes its stand on the Workers' Council system. Accordingly, the political and economic structure of Germany shall be based on the Councils (Räteorganisation). The Councils are the elected representative bodies of the working population in all spheres of political and economic life."

In addition to this, the same group submitted to the Congress a draft of "directives" (*Richtlinien*) in which we read the following:

"All political power is concentrated in the hands of the Congress of Workers' Councils...." "The right to elect and be elected to the Councils shall be enjoyed by all, irrespective of sex, who perform socially necessary and useful labour and do not exploit the labour of others...."

We see, therefore, that the "independent" leaders have turned out to be paltry philistines who are entirely dependent upon the philistine prejudices of the most backward section of the proletariat. In the autumn of 1918, these leaders, through their mouthpiece Kautsky, completely rejected the idea of the Workers' Councils being converted

into state organisations. In March 1919, following in the wake of the masses of the workers, they surrender this position. In April 1919, they throw the decision of their Congress overboard and go over entirely to the position of the Communists: "All Power to the Workers' Councils."

Leaders of this type are not worth very much. There is no need to have leaders to serve as an index of the temper of the most backward section of the proletariat which marches in the rear and not ahead of the vanguard. And considering the spineless way in which they change their slogans, such leaders are worthless. They cannot be trusted. They will *always* be mere ballast, a minus quantity in the working-class movement.

The most "Left" of these leaders, a certain Herr Däumig, argued as follows at the Party Congress (cf. *Freiheit* of March 9):

"Däumig stated that nothing stands between him and the demand of the Communists for 'All Power to the Workers' Councils'. But he must protest against the putschism practised by the Communist Party and against the Byzantinism they display towards the masses instead of educating them. Putschist, isolated action cannot lead to progress...."

By putschism the Germans mean what the old revolutionaries in Russia, some fifty years ago, called "flashes", "pyrotechnics", i.e., small conspiracies, attempts at assassination, revolts, etc.

By accusing the Communists of being "putschists", Herr Däumig merely betrays his own "Byzantinism", his own servility to the philistine prejudices of the petty bourgeoisie. The "Leftism" of a gentleman of this type, who repeats a "fashionable" slogan because he fears the masses but *does not understand the mass revolutionary movement* is not worth a brass farthing.

A powerful wave of spontaneous strikes is sweeping across Germany. The proletarian struggle is evidently growing in intensity to a degree unprecedented even in Russia in 1905, when the strike movement rose to heights that had never been reached before anywhere in the world. Anybody who speaks of "pyrotechnics" in face of such a movement proves that he is a hopeless vulgariser and a slave to philistine prejudices.

Those philistine gentlemen headed by Däumig are probably dreaming of a revolution (that is, if any idea of revolution ever enters their heads) in which the masses will all rise *at once, fully organised*.

Such revolutions never happen, nor can they happen. Capitalism would not be capitalism if it did not keep millions of working people, the vast majority of them, in a state of oppression, wretchedness, want and ignorance. Capitalism cannot collapse except as a result of a revolution which, in the course of struggle, rouses masses who had not hitherto been affected by the movement. Spontaneous outbreaks become inevitable as the revolution matures. There has never been a revolution in which this has not been the case, nor can there be such a revolution.

Herr Däumig lies when he says that the Communists pander to spontaneity; it is the same sort of lie that we heard so often from the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. The Communists do *not* pander to spontaneity, they are *not* in favour of isolated outbreaks. The Communists urge the masses to take organised, integrated, united, opportune and mature action. The philistine slander of Däumig, Kautsky and Co. cannot refute this fact.

But the philistines cannot understand that the Communists quite rightly regard it as their duty *to be with the fighting masses* of the oppressed and not with the philistine heroes who stand aloof from the struggle, timidly waiting to see how things turn out. Mistakes are inevitable when the masses are fighting, but the Communists *remain with the masses*, see these mistakes, explain them to the masses, try to get them rectified, and strive perseveringly for the victory of class-consciousness over spontaneity. It is better to be with the fighting masses, who, in the course of the struggle, gradually learn to rectify their mistakes, than with the paltry intellectuals, philistines, and Kautskyites, who hold aloof until "complete victory" is achieved—this is the truth that the Däumigs cannot understand.

The worse for them. They have already gone down in the history of the world proletarian revolution as cowardly philistines, reactionary snivellers, yesterday the servants of the Scheidemanns and today the advocates of "social peace", and it does not matter whether that advocacy is

concealed by the combination of the Constituent Assembly with the Workers' Councils or by profound condemnation of "putschism".

Herr Kautsky has broken the record for substituting reactionary philistine snivelling for Marxism. He does nothing else but bewail what is taking place, complain, weep, express horror, and urge conciliation! All his life this Knight of the Rueful Countenance *has been writing* about the class struggle and about socialism; but when the class struggle reached maximum intensity, reached the threshold of socialism, our pundit lost his nerve, burst into tears, and turned out to be a common or garden philistine. In issue No. 98 of the organ of the Vienna traitors to socialism, of the Austerlitzes, Renners and Bauers (*Arbeiterzeitung* [Workers' Gazette], April 9, 1919, Vienna, morning edition); Kautsky for the hundredth, if not the thousandth time, sums up all his lamentations in the following words:

"... Economic thinking and economic understanding," he wails, "has been knocked out of the heads of all classes...." "The long war has accustomed large sections of the proletariat to treat economic conditions with absolute contempt and to place all their confidence in the almighty power of violence...."

These are the two "favourite points" of this "extremely learned" man! The "cult of violence" and the break-down of industry—this is what has driven him to the usual, age-old, typical whining and snivelling of the philistine instead of analysing the *real* conditions of the class struggle. "We expected", he writes, "that the revolution would come as the product of the proletarian class struggle ...", "but the revolution came as a consequence of the collapse of the prevailing system in Russia and Germany in the war...."

In other words, this pundit "expected" a peaceful revolution! This is superb!

But Herr Kautsky has lost his nerve to such a degree that he has forgotten what he himself wrote when he was a Marxist, namely, that in all probability a war would provide the occasion for revolution. Today, instead of calmly and fearlessly investigating what changes must *inevitably* take place in the form of the revolution as a consequence of the war, our "theoretician" bewails the collapse of his "expectations"!

"... Large sections of the proletariat ignore economic conditions!"

What utter piffle! How familiar the Menshevik press of Kerensky days made this philistine refrain to us!

The economist Kautsky has forgotten that when a country has been ruined by war and brought to the brink of disaster, the main, the fundamental, the root "economic condition" is to *save the workers*. If the working class is saved from death from starvation, saved from perishing, it will be possible to restore disrupted production. But in order to save the working class it is necessary to have the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the only means of preventing the burdens and consequences of the war from being thrust upon the shoulders of the workers.

The economist Kautsky has "forgotten" that the question of how the burdens of defeat are to be distributed is determined by the *class struggle*, and that amidst the conditions prevailing in an absolutely exhausted, ruined, starving and dying country, the class struggle must *inevitably* assume a different form. It is no longer a class struggle for a share of the results of production, it is not a struggle to take charge of production (for production is at a standstill, there is no coal, the railways have been wrecked, the war has knocked people out of their groove, the machines are worn out, and so on and so forth) but a struggle *to save the workers from starvation*. Only simpletons, even if very "learned" ones, can "condemn", under such circumstances, "consumers", soldiers" communism and superciliously remind the workers of the importance of production.

The first and foremost task is to save the workers. The bourgeoisie want to retain their privileges, to thrust all the consequences of the war upon the workers, and this means starving the workers to death.

The working class wants to save itself from starvation, and for this it is necessary to smash the bourgeoisie, *first* to ensure consumption, even the most meagre, otherwise it will be impossible to *drag out* even an existence of semi-starvation, it will be *impossible to hold out* until industry can be restarted.

"Think of production!" says the well-fed bourgeoisie to the starving and exhausted workers. And Kautsky, repeat-

ing the capitalists' refrain in the guise of "economic science", becomes completely a lackey of the bourgeoisie.

But the workers say that the bourgeoisie, too, should be put on a semi-starvation ration, so that the working people might recuperate somewhat, so that the working people may be *saved from death*. "Consumers' communism" is a means of saving the workers. The workers must be saved, no matter at what sacrifice! Half a pound each for the capitalists, a pound each for the workers—this is the way out of this period of starvation and ruin. Consumption by the starving workers is the basis of, and the condition for, the restoration of industry.

Clara Zetkin was quite right when she told Kautsky that he was "*slipping into bourgeois political economy. Production is for man, and not man for production....*"

Independent Herr Kautsky revealed the same dependence upon petty-bourgeois prejudices when he bewailed the "cult of violence". When, as far back as 1914, the Bolsheviks argued that the imperialist war would become civil war, Herr Kautsky said nothing, but he remained in the same party with David and Co. who denounced this forecast (and slogan) as "madness". Kautsky failed entirely to understand that the imperialist war would inevitably be transformed into civil war; and now he is blaming both combatants in the civil war for his own lack of understanding! Is this not a perfect example of reactionary philistine stupidity?

But while in 1914, failure to understand that the imperialist war must inevitably be transformed into civil war was *only* philistine stupidity, today, in 1919, it is something worse. It is treachery to the working class; for the civil war in Russia, Finland, Latvia, Germany and Hungary, is a *fact*. Kautsky admitted hundreds and hundreds of times in his former writings that there are periods in history when the class struggle is inevitably transformed into the civil war. There is one now, but Kautsky is found in the camp of the vacillating, cowardly, petty bourgeoisie.

"The spirit that inspires Spartacus is virtually the spirit of Ludendorff.... Spartacus is not only encompassing the doom of its own cause, but is also causing an intensification of the policy of violence on the part of the Majority Socialists, Noske is the antipode of Spartacus...."

These words of Kautsky's (quoted from his article in the Vienna *Arbeiterzeitung*) are so infinitely stupid, base and despicable that it is sufficient to point to them without making any comment. The party which tolerates such leaders must be rotten to the core. In the light of these words of Kautsky's, the Berne International, to which Herr Kautsky belongs, must be appraised on its merits as a yellow International.

As a curiosity we shall also quote the argument advanced by Herr Haase, in an article entitled "The International at Amsterdam" (*Freiheit*, May 4, 1919). Herr Haase boasts of having proposed a resolution on the colonial question which states that "it is the function of an alliance of nations organised on the lines proposed by the International ... *before the advent of socialism* ... [please note this!]*... to administer the colonies primarily in the interests of the natives, and then in the interests of all the nations that are united in the alliance of nations...."

A gem, is it not? According to the resolution proposed by this pundit, *before the advent of socialism, the colonies will be administered* not by the bourgeoisie, but by some sort of benevolent, just, sentimental "alliance of nations"! Is this not tantamount to whitewashing the most disgusting capitalist hypocrisy? And these are the "Lefts" in the Berne International....

So that the reader may make a more striking comparison between the stupidity, baseness and despicableness of the writings of Haase, Kautsky and Co. and the real situation in Germany, I shall cite one other brief passage.

The well-known capitalist, Walther Rathenau, recently wrote a book entitled, *Der neue Staat* (The New State). It is dated March 24, 1919. Its value as a theoretical work is nil. But as an observer, Walther Rathenau is compelled to admit the following.

* Interpolations in square brackets in quoted passages have been introduced by Lenin unless otherwise stated.—*Ed.*

"We are a nation of poets and thinkers, but in our auxiliary occupations [*im Nebenberuf*] we are philistinos...."

"Only the extreme monarchists and the Spartacists now have ideals...."

"The unvarnished truth is that we are heading for dictatorship, proletarian or pretorian..." (pp. 29, 52, 65).

Evidently this bourgeois considers himself as "independent" of the bourgeoisie as Kautsky and Haase imagine they are of the petty bourgeoisie and of philistinism.

But Walther Rathenau towers head and shoulders above Karl Kautsky, for the latter snivels, and like a coward hides from the "unvarnished truth", whereas the former frankly admits it.

May 28, 1919

Published in June 1919

Published according to
the manuscript

TELEGRAM TO J. V. STALIN

Stalin,
Smolny,
Petrograd

The circumstances of the whiteguard offensive against Petrograd, taken in their totality, compel one to assume the existence of organised treason behind our lines or, perhaps, even at the front. This is the only explanation for the attack with relatively small forces, the rapid advance and the frequent blowing-up of bridges on the main lines leading to Petrograd. It seems that the enemy is confident that we have no organised armed forces of any importance to resist him and that he can depend on help from the hinterland (the fire in the artillery magazines in Novo-Sokolniki, the destruction of bridges, today's news of the revolt at Oredezh). Please pay greater attention to these circumstances and take extraordinary measures to expose the plots.

Lenin

Written May 29, 1919

Published according to
the signed original

BEWARE OF SPIES!

Death to spies!

The whiteguards' advance on Petrograd has made it perfectly clear that in the vicinity of the front line, in every large town, the Whites have a wide organisation for espionage, subversion, the blowing-up of bridges, the engineering of revolts in the rear and the murder of Communists and prominent members of workers' organisations.

Every man should be on the watch.

Everywhere vigilance must be redoubled and a series of measures evolved and carried out with the greatest strictness to track down and capture spies and whiteguard conspirators.

Railwaymen and political workers in all military units without exception must, in particular, redouble their precautions.

All class-conscious workers and peasants must rise up in defence of Soviet power and must fight the spies and whiteguard traitors. Let every man be on the watch and in regular contact, organised on military lines, with the committees of the Party, with the Extraordinary Commission and with the most trusted and experienced comrades among the Soviet officials.

V. Ulyanov (Lenin),
Chairman of the Council of Workers'
and Peasants' Defence

F. Dzerzhinsky,
People's Commissar of the Interior

DRAFT C.C. DIRECTIVES ON ARMY UNITY

Whereas:

(1) The R.S.F.S.R., in alliance with the fraternal Soviet Republics of the Ukraine, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania and Byelorussia, is compelled to wage a war of defence against the common enemy, world imperialism and the Black-Hundred, whiteguard counter-revolution which imperialism supports;

(2) an essential condition for success in that war is a single command for all contingents of the Red Army, the strictest centralisation of the command of all the forces and resources of the socialist republics, especially of the entire army supply apparatus and also of railway transport which is an important material factor in the war, being of primary importance both for the conduct of operations and for the supply of munitions, equipment and provisions to the Red Army,

the C.C. of the R.C.P. resolves:

(1) to recognise as absolutely essential for the duration of the socialist war of defence the unification of everything connected with supplies for the Red Army under the single guidance of the Council of Defence and other central bodies of the R.S.F.S.R.;

(2) to recognise as absolutely essential for the duration of the socialist war of defence the unification of railway transport and the management of the railway network throughout the entire territory of fraternal socialist republics under the guidance and management of the People's Commissariat of Railways of the R.S.F.S.R.;

(3) to recognise as incompatible with the interests of defence the existence of separate bodies supplying the Red

Army and separate commissariats of railways in the fraternal Soviet republics, and to insist on their being changed for the duration of the war into branches of the R.S.F.S.R. bodies supplying the Red Army and of the People's Commissariat of Railways of the R.S.F.S.R. that shall be under the jurisdiction of and fully subordinated to the central R.S.F.S.R. bodies supplying the Red Army and the People's Commissariat of Railways of the R.S.F.S.R.;

(4) to recognise as subject to annulment all decrees concerning Red Army supplies and railway transport or concerning the management of the railway network wherever they contradict the orders and decrees of the R.S.F.S.R. regulating supplies for the Red Army and the management of railway transport and the railway network of the R.S.F.S.R.

Lenin, Stalin

Written May 1919

Published according
to a typewritten copy

TELEGRAM TO J. V. STALIN

Stalin,
Smolny,
Petrograd

If the situation on the Petrograd Front is favourable bend all efforts for a speedy and decisive offensive, because troops are greatly needed in other places.

Lenin

Written June 4, 1919

Published according to
the manuscript

DRAFT DECISION OF THE C.C. R.C.P. (B.) ON THE PETROGRAD FRONT

The C.C. resolves:

- (1) to recognise the priority importance of the Petrograd Front and to be guided by this in allocating troops, etc.;
- (2) to dispatch two-thirds of the division withdrawn from the Eastern Front to Petrograd and one-third to the Southern Front;
- (3) to instruct the Organising Bureau to adopt the most rigorous emergency measures to step up the removal of Communists from work in the Soviets (central and local) and their transfer to war work, especially in the hinterland and directly behind the front line (combating desertion, army supplies, stores, accelerating mobilisation, etc.);
- (4) a similar instruction is given the Council of Defence and the Council of People's Commissars.

Written not later
than June 10, 1919

Published according to
the manuscript

A GREAT BEGINNING
HEROISM OF THE WORKERS IN THE REAR,
'COMMUNIST SUBBOTNIKS'

Published in July 1919
as a separate pamphlet in Moscow
Signed: *N. Lenin*

Published according to
the manuscript

The press reports many instances of the heroism of the Red Army men. In the fight against Kolchak, Denikin and other forces of the landowners and capitalists, the workers and peasants very often display miracles of bravery and endurance, defending the gains of the socialist revolution. The guerrilla spirit, weariness and indiscipline are being overcome; it is a slow and difficult process, but it is making headway in spite of everything. The heroism of the working people making voluntary sacrifices for the victory of socialism—this is the foundation of the new, comradely discipline in the Red Army, the foundation on which that army is regenerating, gaining strength and growing.

The heroism of the workers in the rear is no less worthy of attention. In this connection, the *communist subbotniks* organised by the workers on their own initiative are really of enormous significance. Evidently, this is only a beginning, but it is a beginning of exceptionally great importance. It is the beginning of a revolution that is more difficult, more tangible, more radical and more decisive than the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, for it is a victory over our own conservatism, indiscipline, petty-bourgeois egoism, a victory over the habits left as a heritage to the worker and peasant by accursed capitalism. Only when *this* victory is consolidated will the new social discipline, socialist discipline, be created; then and only then will a reversion to capitalism

become impossible, will communism become really invincible.

Pravda in its issue of May 17 published an article by A. J. entitled: "Work in a Revolutionary Way. *A Communist Saturday*". This article is so important that we reproduce it here in full.

"WORK IN A REVOLUTIONARY WAY "A COMMUNIST SATURDAY"

"The letter of the Russian Communist Party's Central Committee on working in a *revolutionary way* was a powerful stimulus to communist organisations and to Communists. The general wave of enthusiasm carried many communist railway workers to the front, but the majority of them could not leave their responsible posts or find new forms of working in a revolutionary way. Reports from the localities about the tardiness with which the work of mobilisation was proceeding and the prevalence of red tape compelled the Moscow-Kazan Railway district to turn its attention to the way the railway was functioning. It turned out that, owing to the shortage of labour and low productivity of labour, urgent orders and repairs to locomotives were being held up. At a general meeting of Communists and sympathisers of the Moscow-Kazan Railway district held on May 7, the question was raised of passing from words to deeds in helping to achieve victory over Kolchak. The following resolution was moved:

"In view of the grave domestic and foreign situation, Communists and sympathisers, in order to gain the upper hand over the class enemy, must spur themselves on again and deduct an extra hour from their rest, i.e., lengthen their working day by one hour, accumulate these extra hours and put in six extra hours of manual labour on Saturday for the purpose of creating real values of immediate worth. Since Communists must not grudge their health and life for the gains of the revolution, this work should be performed without pay. *Communist Saturdays* are to be introduced throughout the district and to continue until complete victory over Kolchak has been achieved."

"After some hesitation, the resolution was adopted unanimously.

"On Saturday, May 10, at 6 p.m., the Communists and sympathisers turned up to work like soldiers, formed ranks, and without fuss or bustle were taken by the foremen to the various jobs.

"The results of working in a *revolutionary way* are evident. The accompanying table gives the places of work and the character of the work performed.

Place of work	Character of work	Number employed	Hours worked		Work performed
			Per person	Total	
Moscow. Main locomotive shops	Loading materials for the line, devices for repairing locomotives and carriage parts for Perovo, Murom, Alatyr and Syzran	48	5	240	Loaded 7,500 poods
		21	3	63	Unloaded 1,800 poods
		5	4	20	
Moscow. Passenger depot	Complex current repairs to locomotives	26	5	130	Repairs done on 1½ locomotives
Moscow. Shunting yards	Current repairs to locomotives	24	6	144	2 locomotives completed and parts to be repaired dismantled on 4
Moscow. Carriage department	Current repairs to passenger carriages	12	6	72	2 third-class carriages
Perovo. Main carriage workshops	Carriage repairs and minor repairs on Saturday and Sunday	46 23	5 5	230 115	12 box carriages and two flat carriages
	Total	205	—	1,014	4 locomotives and 16 carriages turned out and 9,300 poods unloaded and loaded

"The total value of the work performed at ordinary rates of pay is five million rubles; calculated at overtime rates it would be fifty per cent higher.

"The productivity of labour in loading waggons was 270 per cent higher than that of regular workers. The productivity of labour on other jobs was approximately the same.

"Jobs (urgent) were done which had been held up for periods ranging from seven days to three months owing to the shortage of labour and to red tape.

"The work was done in spite of the state of disrepair (easily remedied) of implements, as a result of which certain groups were held up from thirty to forty minutes.

"The administration left in charge of the work could hardly keep pace with the men in finding new jobs for them, and perhaps it was only a slight exaggeration when an old foreman said that as much work was done at this *communist Saturday* as would have been done in a week by non-class-conscious and slack workers.

"In view of the fact that many non-Communists, sincere supporters of the Soviet government, took part in the work, and that many more are expected on future Saturdays, and also in view of the fact that many other districts desire to follow the example of the communist railway workers of the Moscow-Kazan Railway, I shall deal in greater detail with the organisational side of the matter as seen from reports received from the localities.

"Of those taking part in the work, some ten per cent were Communists permanently employed in the localities. The rest were persons occupying responsible and elective posts, from the commissar of the railway to commissars of individual enterprises, representatives of the trade union, and employees of the head office and of the Commissariat of Railways.

"The enthusiasm and team spirit displayed during work were extraordinary. When the workers, clerks and head office employees, without even an oath or argument, caught hold of the forty-pood wheel tire of a passenger locomotive and, like industrious ants, rolled it into place, one's heart was filled with fervent joy at the sight of this collective effort, and one's conviction was strengthened that the victory of the working class was unshakable. The international bandits will not crush the victorious workers; the internal saboteurs will not live to see Kolchak.

"When the work was finished those present witnessed an unprecedented scene: a hundred Communists, weary, but with the light of joy in their eyes, greeted their success with the solemn strains of the *Internationale*. And it seemed as if the triumphant strains of the triumphant anthem would sweep over the walls through the whole of working-class Moscow and that like the waves caused by a stone thrown into a pool they would spread through the whole of working-class Russia and shake up the weary and the slack.

"A. J."

Appraising this remarkable "example worthy of emulation", Comrade N. R. in an article in *Pravda* of May 20, under that heading, wrote:

"Cases of Communists working like this are not rare. I know of similar cases at an electric power station, and on various railways. On the Nikolayevskaya Railway, the Communists worked overtime several nights to lift a locomotive that had fallen into the turn-table

pit. In the winter, all the Communists and sympathisers on the Northern Railway worked several Sundays clearing the track of snow; and the communist cells at many goods stations patrol the stations at night to prevent stealing. But all this work was casual and unsystematic. The comrades on the Moscow-Kazan line are making this work systematic and permanent, and this is new. They say in their resolution, 'until complete victory over Kolchak has been achieved', and therein lies the significance of their work. They are lengthening the working day of every Communist and sympathiser by one hour for the duration of the state of war; simultaneously, their productivity of labour is exemplary.

"This example has called forth, and is bound to call forth, further emulation. A general meeting of the Communists and sympathisers on the Alexandrovskaya Railway, after discussing the military situation and the resolution adopted by the comrades on the Moscow-Kazan Railway, resolved: (1) to introduce 'subbotniks' for the Communists and sympathisers on the Alexandrovskaya Railway, the first subbotnik to take place on May 17; (2) to organise the Communists and sympathisers in exemplary, model teams which must show the workers how to work and what can really be done with the present materials and tools, and in the present food situation.

"The Moscow-Kazan comrades say that their example has made a great impression and that they expect a large number of *non-Party* workers to turn up next Saturday. At the time these lines are being written, the Communists have not yet started working overtime in the Alexandrovskaya Railway workshops, but as soon as the rumour spread that they were to do so the mass of non-Party workers stirred themselves. 'We did not know yesterday, otherwise we would have worked as well!' 'I will certainly come next Saturday,' can be heard on all sides. The impression created by work of this sort is very great.

"The example set by the Moscow-Kazan comrades should be emulated by all the communist cells in the rear; not only the communist cells at Moscow Junction, but the whole Party organisation in Russia. In the rural districts too, the communist cells should in the first place set to work to till the fields of Red Army men and thus help their families.

"The comrades on the Moscow-Kazan line finished their first communist subbotnik by singing the *Internationale*. If the communist organisations throughout Russia follow this example and consistently apply it, the Russian Soviet Republic will successfully weather the coming severe months to the mighty strains of the *Internationale* sung by all the working people of the Republic....

"To work, communist comrades!"

On May 23, 1919, *Pravda* reported the following:

"The first communist 'subbotnik' on the Alexandrovskaya Railway took place on May 17. In accordance with the resolution adopted by their general meeting, ninety-eight Communists and sympathisers worked five hours overtime without pay, receiving in return only the right to purchase a second dinner, and, as manual labourers, half a pound of bread to go with their dinner."

Although the work was poorly prepared and organised the *productivity of labour was nevertheless from two to three times higher than usual.*

Here are a few examples.

Five turners turned eighty spindles in four hours. The productivity is 213 per cent of the usual level.

Twenty unskilled workers in four hours collected scrap materials of a total weight of 600 poods, and seventy laminated carriage springs, each weighing $3\frac{1}{2}$ poods, making a total of 850 poods. Productivity, 300 per cent of the usual level.

"The comrades explain this by the fact that ordinarily their work is boring and tiresome, whereas here they worked with a will and with enthusiasm. Now, however, they will be ashamed to turn out less in regular working hours than they did at the communist subbotnik."

"Now many non-Party workers say that they would like to take part in the subbotniks. The locomotive crews volunteer to take locomotives from the 'cemetery', during a subbotnik, repair them and set them going.

"It is reported that similar subbotniks are to be organised on the Vyazma line."

How the work is done at these communist subbotniks is described by Comrade A. Dyachenko in an article in *Pravda* of June 7, entitled "Notes of a Subbotnik Worker". We quote the main passages from this article.

"A comrade and I were very pleased to go and do our 'bit' in the subbotnik arranged by a decision of the railway district committee of the Party; for a time, for a few hours, I would give my head a rest and my muscles a bit of exercise.... We were detailed off to the railway carpentry shop. We got there, found a number of our people, exchanged greetings, engaged in banter for a bit, counted up our forces and found that there were thirty of us.... And in front of us lay a 'monster', a steam boiler weighing no less than six or seven hundred poods; our job was to 'shift' it, i.e., move it over a distance of a quarter or a third of a verst, to its base. We began to have our doubts.... However, we started on the job. Some comrades placed wooden rollers under the boiler, attached two ropes to it, and we began to tug away.... The boiler gave way reluctantly, but at length it budged. We were delighted. After all, there were so few of us.... For nearly two weeks this boiler had resisted the efforts of thrice our number of non-communist workers and nothing could make it budge until we tackled it.... We worked for an hour, strenuously, rhythmically, to the command of our 'foreman'—'one, two, three', and the boiler kept on rolling. Suddenly there was confusion, and a number of our comrades went tumbling on to the ground in the funniest fashion. The rope 'let them down'.... A moment's delay, and a thicker rope

was made fast.... Evening. It was getting dark, but we had yet to negotiate a small hillock, and then our job would soon be done. Our arms ached, our palms burned, we were hot and pulled for all we were worth—and were making headway. The ‘management’ stood round and somewhat shamed by our success, clutched at a rope. ‘Lend a hand, it’s time you did!’ A Red Army man was watching our labours; in his hands he held an accordion. What was he thinking? Who were these people? Why should they work on Saturday when everybody was at home? I solved his riddle and said to him: ‘Comrade, play us a jolly tune. We are not raw hands, we are real Communists. Don’t you see how fast the work is going under our hands? We are not lazy, we are pulling for all we are worth!’ In response, the Red Army man carefully put his accordion on the ground and hastened to grab at a rope end....

“Suddenly Comrade U. struck up the workers’ song ‘Dubinushka’, ‘*anglichanin mudrets*’, he sang, in an excellent tenor voice and we all joined in the refrain of this labour shanty: ‘*Eh, dubinushka, ukhnem, podyornem, podyornem....*’

“We were unaccustomed to the work, our muscles were weary, our shoulders, our backs ached ... but the next day would be a free day, our day of rest, and we would be able to get all the sleep we wanted. The goal was near, and after a little hesitation our ‘monster’ rolled almost right up to the base. ‘Put some boards under, raise it on the base, and let the boiler do the work that has long been expected of it.’ We went off in a crowd to the ‘club room’ of the local Party cell. The room was brightly lit; the walls decorated with posters; rifles stacked around the room. After lustily singing the *Internationale* we enjoyed a glass of tea and ‘rum’, and even bread. This treat, given us by the local comrades, was very welcome after our arduous toil. We took a brotherly farewell of our comrades and lined up. The strains of revolutionary songs echoed through the slumbering streets in the silence of the night and our measured tread kept time with the music. We sang ‘Comrades, the Bugles Are Sounding’, ‘Arise Ye Starvelings from Your Slumbers’, songs of the International and of labour.

“A week passed. Our arms and shoulders were back to normal and we were going to another ‘subbotnik’, nine versts away this time, to repair railway waggons. Our destination was Perovo. The comrades climbed on the roof of an ‘American’ box waggon and sang the *Internationale* well and with gusto. The people on the train listened to the singing, evidently in surprise. The wheels knocked a measured beat, and those of us who failed to get on to the roof clung to the steps, pretending to be ‘devil-may-care’ passengers. The train pulled in. We had reached our destination. We passed through a long yard and were warmly greeted by the commissar, Comrade G.

“There is plenty of work, but few to do it! Only thirty of us, and in six hours we have to do average repairs to a baker’s dozen of waggons! Here are twin-wheels already marked. We have not only empty waggons, but also a filled cistern.... But that’s nothing, we’ll ‘make a job of it’, comrades!’

“Work went with a swing. Five comrades and I were working with

hoists. Under pressure of our shoulders and two hoists, and directed by our 'foreman', these twin-wheels, weighing from sixty to seventy poods apiece, skipped from one track to another in the liveliest possible manner. One pair disappeared, another rolled into place. At last all were in their assigned places, and swiftly we shifted the old worn-out junk into a shed.... One, two, three—and, raised by a revolving iron hoist, they were dislogged from the rails in a trice. Over there, in the dark, we heard the rapid strokes of hammers; the comrades, like worker bees, were busy on their 'sick' cars. Some were carpentering, others painting, still others were covering roofs, to the joy of the comrade commissar and our own. The smiths also asked for our aid. In a portable smithy a rod with a coupling hook was gleaming white-hot; it had been bent by careless shunting. It was laid on the anvil, scattering white sparks, and, under the experienced direction of the smith, our trusty hammers beat it back into its proper shape. Still red-hot and spitting sparks, we rushed it on our shoulders to where it had to go. We pushed it into its socket. A few hammer strokes and it was fixed. We crawled under the waggon. The coupling system is not as simple as it looks; there are all sorts of contraptions with rivets and springs....

"Work was in full swing. Night was falling. The torches seemed to burn brighter than before. Soon it would be time to knock off. Some of the comrades were taking a 'rest' against some tires and 'sipping' hot tea. The May night was cool, and the new moon shone beautifully like a gleaming sickle in the sky. People were laughing and joking.

"Knock off, Comrade G., thirteen waggons are enough!"

"But Comrade G. was not satisfied.

"We finished our tea, broke into our songs of triumph, and marched to the door...."

The movement of "communist subbotniks" is not confined to Moscow. *Pravda* of June 6 reported the following:

"The first communist subbotnik in Tver took place on May 31. One hundred and twenty-eight Communists worked on the railway. In three and a half hours they loaded and unloaded fourteen waggons, repaired three locomotives, cut up ten sagesen of firewood and performed other work. The productivity of labour of the skilled communist workers was thirteen times above normal."

Again, on June 8 we read in *Pravda*:

"COMMUNIST SUBBOTNIKS

"*Saratov*, June 5. In response to the appeal of their Moscow comrades, the communist railway workers here at a general Party meeting resolved: to work five hours overtime on Saturdays without pay in order to support the national economy."

* * *

I have given the fullest and most detailed information about the communist subbotniks because in this we undoubt-

edly observe one of the most important aspects of communist construction, to which our press pays insufficient attention, and which all of us have as yet failed properly to appreciate.

Less political fireworks and more attention to the simplest but living facts of communist construction, taken from and tested by actual life—this is the slogan which all of us, our writers, agitators, propagandists, organisers, etc., should repeat unceasingly.

It was natural and inevitable in the first period after the proletarian revolution that we should be engaged primarily on the main and fundamental task of overcoming the resistance of the bourgeoisie, of vanquishing the exploiters, of crushing their conspiracy (like the "slave-owners' conspiracy" to surrender Petrograd, in which all from the Black Hundreds and Cadets to the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries were involved⁶⁶). But simultaneously with this task, another task comes to the forefront just as inevitably and ever more imperatively as time goes on, namely, the more important task of positive communist construction, the creation of new economic relations, of a new society.

As I have had occasion to point out more than once, among other occasions in the speech I delivered at a session of the Petrograd Soviet on March 12, the dictatorship of the proletariat is not only the use of force against the exploiters, and not even mainly the use of force. The economic foundation of this use of revolutionary force, the guarantee of its effectiveness and success is the fact that the proletariat represents and creates a higher type of social organisation of labour compared with capitalism. This is what is important, this is the source of the strength and the guarantee that the final triumph of communism is inevitable.

The feudal organisation of social labour rested on the discipline of the bludgeon, while the working people, robbed and tyrannised by a handful of landowners, were utterly ignorant and downtrodden. The capitalist organisation of social labour rested on the discipline of hunger, and, notwithstanding all the progress of bourgeois culture and bourgeois democracy, the vast mass of the working people in the most advanced, civilised and democratic republics remained an ignorant and downtrodden mass of wage-slaves or oppressed peasants, robbed and tyrannised by a handful

of capitalists. The communist organisation of social labour, the first step towards which is socialism, rests, and will do so more and more as time goes on, on the free and conscious discipline of the working people themselves who have thrown off the yoke both of the landowners and capitalists.

This new discipline does not drop from the skies, nor is it born from pious wishes; it grows out of the material conditions of large-scale capitalist production, and out of them alone. Without them it is impossible. And the repository, or the vehicle, of these material conditions is a definite historical class, created, organised, united, trained, educated and hardened by large-scale capitalism. This class is the proletariat.

If we translate the Latin, scientific, historico-philosophical term "dictatorship of the proletariat" into simpler language, it means just the following:

Only a definite class, namely, the urban workers and the factory, industrial workers in general, is able to lead the whole mass of the working and exploited people in the struggle to throw off the yoke of capital, in actually carrying it out, in the struggle to maintain and consolidate the victory, in the work of creating the new, socialist social system and in the entire struggle for the complete abolition of classes. (Let us observe in parenthesis that the only scientific distinction between socialism and communism is that the first term implies the first stage of the new society arising out of capitalism, while the second implies the next and higher stage.)

The mistake the "Berne" yellow International makes is that its leaders accept the class struggle and the leading role of the proletariat only in word and are afraid to think it out to its logical conclusion. They are afraid of that inevitable conclusion which particularly terrifies the bourgeoisie, and which is absolutely unacceptable to them. They are afraid to admit that the dictatorship of the proletariat is *also* a period of class struggle, which is inevitable as long as classes have not been abolished, and which changes in form, being particularly fierce and particularly peculiar in the period immediately following the overthrow of capital. The proletariat does not cease the class struggle after it has captured political power, but continues it until

classes are abolished—of course, under different circumstances, in different form and by different means.

And what does the "abolition of classes" mean? All those who call themselves socialists recognise this as the ultimate goal of socialism, but by no means all give thought to its significance. Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labour, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. Classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy.

Clearly, in order to abolish classes completely, it is not enough to overthrow the exploiters, the landowners and capitalists, not enough to abolish *their* rights of ownership; it is necessary also to abolish *all* private ownership of the means of production, it is necessary to abolish the distinction between town and country, as well as the distinction between manual workers and brain workers. This requires a very long period of time. In order to achieve this an enormous step forward must be taken in developing the productive forces; it is necessary to overcome the resistance (frequently passive, which is particularly stubborn and particularly difficult to overcome) of the numerous survivals of small-scale production; it is necessary to overcome the enormous force of habit and conservatism which are connected with these survivals.

The assumption that all "working, people" are equally capable of doing this work would be an empty phrase, or the illusion of an antediluvian, pre-Marxist socialist; for this ability does not come of itself, but grows historically, and grows *only* out of the material conditions of large-scale capitalist production. This ability, at the beginning of the road from capitalism to socialism, is possessed by the proletariat *alone*. It is capable of fulfilling the gigantic task that confronts it, first, because it is the strongest and most advanced class in civilised societies; secondly, because in the most developed countries it constitutes the majority

of the population, and thirdly, because in backward capitalist countries, like Russia, the majority of the population consists of semi-proletarians, i.e., of people who regularly live in a proletarian way part of the year, who regularly earn a part of their means of subsistence as wage-workers in capitalist enterprises.

Those who try to solve the problems involved in the transition from capitalism to socialism on the basis of general talk about liberty, equality, democracy in general, equality of labour democracy, etc. (as Kautsky, Martov and other heroes of the Berne yellow International do), thereby only reveal their petty-bourgeois, philistine nature and ideologically slavishly follow in the wake of the bourgeoisie. The correct solution of this problem can be found only in a concrete study of the specific relations between the specific class which has conquered political power, namely, the proletariat, and the whole non-proletarian, and also semi-proletarian, mass of the working population—relations which do not take shape in fantastically harmonious, “ideal” conditions, but in the real conditions of the frantic resistance of the bourgeoisie which assumes many and diverse forms.

The vast majority of the population—and all the more so of the working population—of any capitalist country, including Russia, have thousands of times experienced, themselves and through their kith and kin, the oppression of capital, the plunder and every sort of tyranny it perpetrates. The imperialist war, i.e., the slaughter of ten million people in order to decide whether British or German capital was to have supremacy in plundering the whole world, has greatly intensified these ordeals, has increased and deepened them, and has made the people realise their meaning. Hence the inevitable sympathy displayed by the vast majority of the population, particularly the working people, for the proletariat, because it is with heroic courage and revolutionary ruthlessness throwing off the yoke of capital, overthrowing the exploiters, suppressing their resistance, and shedding its blood to pave the road for the creation of the new society, in which there will be no room for exploiters.

Great and inevitable as may be their petty-bourgeois vacillations and their tendency to go back to bourgeois

"order", under the "wing" of the bourgeoisie, the non-proletarian and semi-proletarian mass of the working population cannot but recognise the moral and political authority of the proletariat, who are not only overthrowing the exploiters and suppressing their resistance, but are building a new and higher social bond, a social discipline, the discipline of class-conscious and united working people, who know no yoke and no authority except the authority of their own unity, of their own, more class-conscious, bold, solid, revolutionary and steadfast vanguard.

In order to achieve victory, in order to build and consolidate socialism, the proletariat must fulfil a twofold or dual task: first, it must, by its supreme heroism in the revolutionary struggle against capital, win over the entire mass of the working and exploited people; it must win them over, organise them and lead them in the struggle to overthrow the bourgeoisie and utterly suppress their resistance. Secondly, it must lead the whole mass of the working and exploited people, as well as all the petty-bourgeois groups, on to the road of new economic development, towards the creation of a new social bond, a new labour discipline, a new organisation of labour, which will combine the last word in science and capitalist technology with the mass association of class-conscious workers creating large-scale socialist industry.

The second task is more difficult than the first, for it cannot possibly be fulfilled by single acts of heroic fervour; it requires the most prolonged, most persistent and most difficult mass heroism in *plain, everyday* work. But this task is more essential than the first, because, in the last analysis, the deepest source of strength for victories over the bourgeoisie and the sole guarantee of the durability and permanence of these victories can only be a new and higher mode of social production, the substitution of large-scale socialist production for capitalist and petty-bourgeois production.

* * *

"Communist subbotniks" are of such enormous historical significance precisely because they demonstrate the conscious and voluntary initiative of the workers in developing

the productivity of labour, in adopting a new labour discipline, in creating socialist conditions of economy and life.

J. Jacoby, one of the few, in fact it would be more correct to say one of the exceptionally rare, German bourgeois democrats who, after the lessons of 1870-71, went over not to chauvinism or national-liberalism, but to socialism, once said that the formation of a single trade union was of greater historical importance than the battle of Sadowa.⁶⁷ This is true. The battle of Sadowa decided the supremacy of one of two bourgeois monarchies, the Austrian or the Prussian, in creating a German national capitalist state. The formation of one trade union was a small step towards the world victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie. And we may similarly say that the first communist subbotnik, organised by the workers of the Moscow-Kazan Railway in Moscow on May 10, 1919, was of greater historical significance than any of the victories of Hindenburg, or of Foch and the British, in the 1914-18 imperialist war. The victories of the imperialists mean the slaughter of millions of workers for the sake of the profits of the Anglo-American and French multimillionaires, they are the atrocities of doomed capitalism, bloated with over-eating and rotting alive. The communist subbotnik organised by the workers of the Moscow-Kazan Railway is one of the cells of the new, socialist society, which brings to all the peoples of the earth emancipation from the yoke of capital and from wars.

The bourgeois gentlemen and their hangers-on, including the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, who are wont to regard themselves as the representatives of "public opinion", naturally jeer at the hopes of the Communists, call those hopes "a baobab tree in a mignonette pot", sneer at the insignificance of the number of subbotniks compared with the vast number of cases of thieving, idleness, lower productivity, spoilage of raw materials and finished goods, etc. Our reply to these gentlemen is that if the bourgeois intellectuals had dedicated their knowledge to assisting the working people instead of giving it to the Russian and foreign capitalists in order to restore their power, the revolution would have proceeded more rapidly and more peacefully. But this is utopian, for the issue is decided by the class struggle, and the majority of the intellectuals gravitate

towards the bourgeoisie. Not with the assistance of the intellectuals will the proletariat achieve victory, but in spite of their opposition (at least in the majority of cases), removing those of them who are incorrigibly bourgeois, reforming, re-educating and subordinating the waverers, and gradually winning ever larger sections of them to its side. Gloating over the difficulties and setbacks of the revolution, sowing panic, preaching a return to the past—these are all weapons and methods of class struggle of the bourgeois intellectuals. The proletariat will not allow itself to be deceived by them.

If we get down to brass tacks, however, has it ever happened in history that a new mode of production has taken root immediately, without a long succession of setbacks, blunders and relapses? Half a century after the abolition of serfdom there were still quite a number of survivals of serfdom in the Russian countryside. Half a century after the abolition of slavery in America the position of the Negroes was still very often one of semi-slavery. The bourgeois intellectuals, including the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, are true to themselves in serving capital and in continuing to use absolutely false arguments—before the proletarian revolution they accused us of being utopian; after the revolution they demand that we wipe out all traces of the past with fantastic rapidity!

We are not utopians, however, and we know the real value of bourgeois "arguments"; we also know that for some time after the revolution traces of the old ethics will inevitably predominate over the young shoots of the new. When the new has just been born the old always remains stronger than it for some time; this is always the case in nature and in social life. Jeering at the feebleness of the young shoots of the new order, cheap scepticism of the intellectuals and the like—these are, essentially, methods of bourgeois class struggle against the proletariat, a defence of capitalism against socialism. We must carefully study the feeble new shoots, we must devote the greatest attention to them, do everything to promote their growth and "nurse" them. Some of them will inevitably perish. We cannot vouch that precisely the "communist subbotniks" will play a particularly important role. But that is not the point. The point is to foster each and every shoot of the new; and life will

select the most viable. If the Japanese scientist, in order to help mankind vanquish syphilis, had the patience to test six hundred and five preparations before he developed a six hundred and sixth which met definite requirements, then those who want to solve a more difficult problem, namely, to vanquish capitalism, must have the perseverance to try hundreds and thousands of new methods, means and weapons of struggle in order to elaborate the most suitable of them.

The "communist subbotniks" are so important because they were initiated by workers who were by no means placed in exceptionally good conditions, by workers of various specialities, and some with no speciality at all, just unskilled labourers, who are living under *ordinary*, i.e., *exceedingly hard*, conditions. We all know very well the main cause of the decline in the productivity of labour that is to be observed not only in Russia, but all over the world; it is ruin and impoverishment, embitterment and weariness caused by the imperialist war, sickness and malnutrition. The latter is first in importance. Starvation—that is the cause. And in order to do away with starvation, productivity of labour must be raised in agriculture, in transport and in industry. So, we get a sort of vicious circle: in order to raise productivity of labour we must save ourselves from starvation, and in order to save ourselves from starvation we must raise productivity of labour.

We know that in practice such contradictions are solved by breaking the vicious circle, by bringing about a radical change in the temper of the people, by the heroic initiative of the individual groups which often plays a decisive role against the background of such a radical change. The unskilled labourers and railway workers of Moscow (of course, we have in mind the majority of them, and not a handful of profiteers, officials and other whiteguards) are working people who are living in desperately hard conditions. They are constantly underfed, and now, before the new harvest is gathered, with the general worsening of the food situation, they are actually starving. And yet these starving workers, surrounded by the malicious counter-revolutionary agitation of the bourgeoisie, the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, are organising "communist subbotniks",

working overtime *without any pay*, and achieving an enormous increase in the productivity of labour in spite of the fact that they are weary, tormented, and exhausted by malnutrition. Is this not supreme heroism? Is this not the beginning of a change of momentous significance?

In the last analysis, productivity of labour is the most important, the principal thing for the victory of the new social system. Capitalism created a productivity of labour unknown under serfdom. Capitalism can be utterly vanquished, and will be utterly vanquished by socialism creating a new and much higher productivity of labour. This is a very difficult matter and must take a long time; but *it has been started*, and that is the main thing. If in starving Moscow, in the summer of 1919, the starving workers who had gone through four trying years of imperialist war and another year and a half of still more trying civil war could start this great work, how will things develop later when we triumph in the civil war and win peace?

Communism is the higher productivity of labour—compared with that existing under capitalism—of voluntary, class-conscious and united workers employing advanced techniques. Communist subbotniks are extraordinarily valuable as the *actual* beginning of *communism*; and this is a very rare thing, because we are in a stage when “only the *first steps* in the transition from capitalism to communism are being taken” (as our Party Programme quite rightly says).

Communism begins when the *rank-and-file workers* display an enthusiastic concern that is undaunted by arduous toil to increase the productivity of labour, husband *every pood of grain, coal, iron* and other products, which do not accrue to the workers personally or to their “close” kith and kin, but to their “distant” kith and kin, i. e., to society as a whole, to tens and hundreds of millions of people united first in one socialist state, and then in a union of Soviet republics.

In *Capital*, Karl Marx ridicules the pompous and grandiloquent bourgeois-democratic great charter of liberty and the rights of man, ridicules all this phrase-mongering about liberty, equality and fraternity *in general*, which dazzles the petty bourgeois and philistines of all countries, including the present despicable heroes of the despicable Berne

International. Marx contrasts these pompous declarations of rights to the plain, modest, practical, simple manner in which the question is presented by the proletariat—the legislative enactment of a shorter working day is a typical example of such treatment.⁶⁸ The aptness and profundity of Marx's observation become the clearer and more obvious to us the more the content of the proletarian revolution unfolds. The "formulas" of genuine communism differ from the pompous, intricate, and solemn phraseology of the Kautskys, the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries and their beloved "brethren" of Berne in that they reduce everything to the *conditions of labour*. Less chatter about "labour democracy", about "liberty, equality and fraternity", about "government by the people", and all such stuff; the class-conscious workers and peasants of our day see through these pompous phrases of the bourgeois intellectual and discern the trickery as easily as a person of ordinary common sense and experience, when glancing at the irreproachably "polished" features and immaculate appearance of the "fain fellow, dontcher know", immediately and unerringly puts him down as "in all probability, a scoundrel".

Fewer pompous phrases, more plain, *everyday* work, concern for the pood of grain and the pood of coal! More concern about providing this pood of grain and pood of coal needed by the hungry workers and ragged and barefoot peasants *not* by *haggling*, not in a capitalist manner, but by the conscious, voluntary, boundlessly heroic labour of plain working men like the unskilled labourers and railwaymen of the Moscow-Kazan line.

We must all admit that vestiges of the bourgeois-intellectual phrase-mongering approach to questions of the revolution are in evidence at every step, everywhere, even in our own ranks. Our press, for example, does little to fight these rotten survivals of the rotten, bourgeois-democratic past; it does little to foster the simple, modest, ordinary but viable shoots of genuine communism.

Take the position of women. In this field, not a single democratic party in the world, not even in the most advanced bourgeois republic, has done in decades so much as a hundredth part of what we did in our very first year in power. We really razed to the ground the infamous laws placing

women in a position of inequality, restricting divorce and surrounding it with disgusting formalities, denying recognition to children born out of wedlock, enforcing a search for their fathers, etc., laws numerous survivals of which, to the shame of the bourgeoisie and of capitalism, are to be found in all civilised countries. We have a thousand times the right to be proud of what we have done in this field. But the more *thoroughly* we have cleared the ground of the lumber of the old, bourgeois laws and institutions, the clearer it is to us that we have only cleared the ground to build on but are not yet building.

Notwithstanding all the laws emancipating woman, she continues to be a *domestic slave*, because *petty housework* crushes, strangles, stultifies and degrades her, chains her to the kitchen and the nursery, and she wastes her labour on barbarously unproductive, petty, nerve-racking, stultifying and crushing drudgery. The real *emancipation of women*, real communism, will begin only where and when an all-out struggle begins (led by the proletariat wielding the state power) against this petty housekeeping, or rather when its *wholesale transformation* into a large-scale socialist economy begins.

Do we in practice pay sufficient attention to this question, which in theory every Communist considers indisputable? Of course not. Do we take proper care of the *shoots* of communism which already exist in this sphere? Again the answer is *no*. Public catering establishments, nurseries, kindergartens—here we have examples of these shoots, here we have the simple, everyday means, involving nothing pompous, grandiloquent or ceremonial, which can *really emancipate women*, really lessen and abolish their inequality with men as regards their role in social production and public life. These means are not new, they (like all the material prerequisites for socialism) were created by large-scale capitalism. But under capitalism they remained, first, a rarity, and secondly—which is particularly important—either *profit-making* enterprises, with all the worst features of speculation, profiteering, cheating and fraud, or “acrobatics of bourgeois charity”, which the best workers rightly hated and despised.

There is no doubt that the number of these institutions in our country has increased enormously and that they are

beginning to change in character. There is no doubt that we have far more *organising talent* among the working and peasant women than we are aware of, that we have far more people than we know of who can organise practical work, with the co-operation of large numbers of workers and of still larger numbers of consumers, without that abundance of talk, fuss, squabbling and chatter about plans, systems, etc., with which our big-headed "intellectuals" or half-baked "Communists" are "affected". But we *do not nurse* these shoots of the new as we should.

Look at the bourgeoisie. How very well they know how to advertise what *they* need! See how millions of copies of *their* newspapers extol what the capitalists regard as "model" enterprises, and how "model" bourgeois institutions are made an object of national pride! Our press does not take the trouble, or hardly ever, to describe the best catering establishments or nurseries, in order, by daily insistence, to get some of them turned into models of their kind. It does not give them enough publicity, does not describe in detail the saving in human labour, the conveniences for the consumer, the economy of products, the emancipation of women from domestic slavery, the improvement in sanitary conditions, that can be achieved with *exemplary communist work* and extended to the whole of society, to all working people.

Exemplary production, exemplary communist subbotniks, exemplary care and conscientiousness in procuring and distributing every pood of grain, exemplary catering establishments, exemplary cleanliness in such-and-such a workers' house, in such-and-such a block, should all receive ten times more attention and care from our press, as well as from *every* workers' and peasants' organisation, than they receive now. All these are shoots of communism, and it is our common and primary duty to nurse them. Difficult as our food and production situation is, in the year and a half of Bolshevik rule there has been undoubted progress *all along the line*: grain procurements have increased from 30 million poods (from August 1, 1917 to August 1, 1918) to 100 million poods (from August 1, 1918 to May 1, 1919); vegetable gardening has expanded, the margin of unsown land has diminished, railway transport has begun to improve despite the enormous fuel difficulties, and so on. Against

this general background, and with the support of the proletarian state power, the shoots of communism will not wither; they will grow and blossom into complete communism.

* * *

We must give very great thought to the significance of the "communist subbotniks", in order that we may draw all the very important practical lessons that follow from this great beginning.

The first and main lesson is that this beginning must be given every assistance. The word "commune" is being handled much too freely. Any kind of enterprise started by Communists or with their participation is very often at once declared to be a "commune", it being not infrequently forgotten that this *very honourable title* must be *won* by prolonged and persistent effort, by *practical* achievement in genuine communist development.

That is why, in my opinion, the decision that has matured in the minds of the majority of the members of the Central Executive Committee to *repeal* the decree of the Council of People's Commissars, as far as it pertains to the title "consumers' communes",⁶⁹ is quite right. Let the title be simpler—and, incidentally, the defects and shortcomings of the *initial* stages of the new organisational work will not be blamed on the "communes", but (as in all fairness they should be) on *bad* Communists. It would be a good thing to eliminate the word "commune" from *common* use, to prohibit every Tom, Dick and Harry from grabbing at it, or to *allow this title to be borne only* by genuine communes, which have really demonstrated in practice (and have proved by the unanimous recognition of the whole of the surrounding population) that they are capable of organising their work in a communist manner. First show that you are capable of working without remuneration in the interests of society, in the interests of all the working people, show that you are capable of "working in a revolutionary way", that you are capable of raising productivity of labour, of organising the work in an exemplary manner, and then hold out your hand for the honourable title "commune"!

In this respect, the "communist subbotniks" are a most valuable exception; for the unskilled labourers and railwaymen of the Moscow-Kazan Railway *first* demonstrated *by deeds* that they are capable of working like *Communists*, and then adopted the title of "communist subbotniks" for their undertaking. We must see to it and make sure that in future anyone who calls his enterprise, institution or undertaking a commune *without having proved* this by hard work and practical *success in prolonged effort*, by exemplary and truly communist organisation, is mercilessly ridiculed and pilloried as a charlatan or a windbag.

That great beginning, the "communist subbotniks", must also be utilised for another purpose, namely, to *purge* the Party. In the early period following the revolution, when the mass of "honest" and philistine-minded people was particularly timorous, and when the bourgeois intellectuals to a man, including, of course, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, played the lackey to the bourgeoisie and carried on sabotage, it was absolutely inevitable that adventurers and other pernicious elements should hitch themselves to the ruling party. There never has been, and there never can be, a revolution without that. The whole point is that the ruling party should be able, relying on a sound and strong advanced class, to purge its ranks.

We started this work long ago. It must be continued steadily and untiringly. The mobilisation of Communists for the war helped us in this respect: the cowards and scoundrels fled from the Party's ranks. Good riddance! *Such* a reduction in the Party's membership means an *enormous increase* in its strength and weight. We must continue the purge, and that new beginning, the "communist subbotniks", must be utilised for this purpose: members should be accepted into the Party only after six months', say, "trial", or "probation", at "working in a revolutionary way". A similar test should be demanded of *all* members of the Party who joined after October 25, 1917, and who have not proved by some special work or service that they are absolutely reliable, loyal and capable of being Communists.

The purging of the Party, through the steadily *increasing demands* it makes in regard to working in a genuinely communist way, will improve the state *apparatus* and will

bring much nearer the *final transition* of the peasants to the side of the revolutionary proletariat.

Incidentally, the "communist subbotniks" have thrown a remarkably strong light on the class character of the state apparatus under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Central Committee of the Party drafts a letter on "working in a revolutionary way".⁷⁰ The idea is suggested by the Central Committee of a party with from 100,000 to 200,000 members (I assume that that is the number that will remain after a thorough purging; at present the membership is larger).

The idea is taken up by the workers organised in trade unions. In Russia and the Ukraine they number about four million. The overwhelming majority of them are for the state power of the proletariat, for proletarian dictatorship. Two hundred thousand and four million—such is the ratio of the "gear-wheels", if one may so express it. Then follow the *tens of millions* of peasants, who are divided into three main groups: the most numerous and the one standing closest to the proletariat is that of the semi-proletarians or poor peasants; then come the middle peasants, and lastly the numerically very small group of kulaks or rural bourgeoisie.

As long as it is possible to trade in grain and to make profit out of famine, the peasant will remain (and this will for some time be inevitable under the dictatorship of the proletariat) a semi-working man, a semi-profitier. As a profitier he is hostile to us, hostile to the proletarian state; he is inclined to agree with the bourgeoisie and their faithful lackeys, up to and including the Menshevik Sher or the Socialist-Revolutionary B. Chernenkov, who stand for freedom to trade in grain. But *as a working man*, the peasant is a friend of the proletarian state, a most loyal ally of the worker in the struggle against the landowner and against the capitalist. As working men, the peasants, the vast mass of them, the peasant millions, support the state "machine" which is headed by the one or two hundred thousand Communists of the proletarian vanguard, and which consists of millions of organised proletarians.

A state more democratic, in the true sense of the word, one more closely connected with the working and exploited people, *has never yet existed*.

It is precisely proletarian work such as that put into "communist subbotniks" that will win the complete respect and love of peasants for the proletarian state. Such work and such work alone will completely convince the peasant that we are right, that communism is right, and make him our devoted ally, and, hence, will lead to the complete elimination of our food difficulties, to the complete victory of communism over capitalism in the matter of the production and distribution of grain, to the unqualified consolidation of communism.

June 28, 1919

TELEGRAM TO J. V. STALIN

Smolny, Petrograd

Ekaterinoslav captured. Desperate munitions situation in the South. Since you have received three million cartridges and the stocks at Vidlitsa⁷¹ you must exercise the greatest economy of cartridges and other munitions.

Lenin

Written June 30, 1919

Published according to
the telegraph form

ALL OUT FOR THE FIGHT AGAINST DENIKIN!

**LETTER OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE RUSSIAN COMMUNIST PARTY (BOLSHEVIKS)
TO PARTY ORGANISATIONS**

Comrades,

This is one of the most critical, probably even the most critical moment for the socialist revolution. Those who defend the exploiters, the landowners and capitalists, in Russia and abroad (primarily in Britain and France) are making a desperate effort to restore the power of those who seize the results of the people's labour, the landowners and exploiters of Russia, in order to bolster up their power, which is waning all over the world. The British and French capitalists have failed in their plan to conquer the Ukraine using their own troops; they have failed in their support of Kolchak in Siberia; the Red Army, heroically advancing in the Urals with the help of the Urals workers who are rising to a man, is nearing Siberia to liberate it from the incredible tyranny and brutality of the capitalists who rule there. Lastly, the British and French imperialists have failed in their plan to seize Petrograd by means of a counter-revolutionary conspiracy with the participation of Russian monarchists, Cadets, Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries (not excluding even Left Socialist-Revolutionaries).

The foreign capitalists are now making a desperate effort to restore the yoke of capital by means of an onslaught by Denikin, whom they have supplied with officers, shells, tanks, etc., etc., as they once did Kolchak.

All the forces of the workers and peasants, all the forces of the Soviet Republic, must be harnessed to repulse Denikin's onslaught and to defeat him, without checking the Red Army's victorious advance into the Urals and Siberia.

That is the

MAIN TASK OF THE MOMENT

All Communists first and foremost, all sympathisers with them, all honest workers and peasants, all Soviet officials must *pull themselves together like soldiers* and concentrate to the maximum their work, their efforts and their concern *directly on the tasks of the war*, on the speedy repulse of Denikin's attack, curtailing and rearranging all their other activities to allow for this task.

The Soviet Republic is besieged by the enemy. It must become a *single military camp*, not in word but in deed.

All the work of all institutions must be adapted to the war and placed on a military footing!

Collegiate methods are essential for the conduct of the affairs of the workers' and peasants' state. But any expansion of these methods, any distortion of them resulting in red tape and irresponsibility, any conversion of collegiate bodies into talk-shops is a supreme evil, an evil which must be halted at all costs as quickly as possible and by whatever the means.

Collegiate methods must not exceed an absolutely indispensable minimum in respect both to the number of members in the committees and to the efficient conduct of work; "speechifying" must be prohibited, opinions must be exchanged as rapidly as possible and confined to information and precisely formulated practical proposals.

Whenever there is the slightest possibility, such methods must be reduced to the briefest discussion of only the most important questions in the narrowest collegiate bodies, while the *practical management* of institutions, enterprises, undertakings or tasks should be entrusted to *one comrade*, known for his firmness, resolution, boldness and ability to conduct practical affairs and who enjoys the greatest confidence. At any rate, and under all circumstances without exception, collegiate management must be accompanied by the precisest definition of the personal responsibility of *every* individual for a *precisely* defined job. To refer to collegiate methods as an excuse for irresponsibility is a most dangerous evil, threatening all who have not had very extensive experience in efficient collective work; in the army

it all too often leads to inevitable disaster, chaos, panic, division of authority and defeat.

A no less dangerous evil is organisational fuss or organisational fantasies. The reorganisation of work necessitated by the war must under no circumstances lead to the reorganisation of institutions, still less to the hasty formation of new institutions. That is absolutely impermissible and would only lead to chaos. The reorganisation of work should consist in suspending for a time institutions which are not absolutely essential, or in reducing their size to a certain extent. But all war work must be conducted *entirely and exclusively through already existing* military institutions, by improving, strengthening, expanding and supporting them. The creation of special "defence committees" or "rev-coms" (revolutionary or revolutionary military committees) is permissible, first, only by way of exception, secondly, only with the approval of the military authority concerned or the superior Soviet authority, and, thirdly, only provided this last condition is complied with.

THE TRUTH ABOUT KOLCHAK AND DENIKIN MUST BE EXPLAINED TO THE PEOPLE

Kolchak and Denikin are the chief, and the only serious, enemies of the Soviet Republic. If it were not for the help they are getting from the Entente (Britain, France, America) they would have collapsed long ago. It is only the help of the Entente which makes them strong. Nevertheless, they are still forced to deceive the people, to pretend from time to time that they support "democracy", a "constituent assembly", "government by the people", etc. The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries are only too willing to be duped.

The truth about Kolchak (and his double, Denikin) has now been revealed in full. The shooting of *tens of thousands* of workers. The shooting even of Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. The flogging of peasants of entire districts. The public flogging of women. The absolutely unbridled power of the officers, the sons of landowners. Endless looting. Such is the truth about Kolchak and Denikin. Increasing

numbers of people even among the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, who themselves betrayed the workers and sided with Kolchak and Denikin, are forced to admit this truth.

All our agitation and propaganda must serve to inform the people of the truth. It must be explained that the alternative is either Kolchak and Denikin or Soviet power, the power (dictatorship) of the workers. There is no middle course; there can be no middle course. Particular use must be made of the testimony of non-Bolshevik eyewitnesses, of Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries, and non-party people who *have been* in the areas overrun by Kolchak or Denikin. Let every worker and peasant know what the issue of the struggle is, what awaits him in the event of a victory for Kolchak or Denikin.

WORK AMONG MEN CALLED UP FOR SERVICE

One of our chief concerns must now be work among those liable to mobilisation, in aid of mobilisation, and among those already mobilised. Wherever mobilised men are concentrated, or where there are garrisons, and especially training depots, etc., every single Communist and sympathiser must be brought into action. They must all without exception unite and work, some daily, others, say, four or eight hours per week, in aid of mobilisation and among mobilised men, among the soldiers of the local garrison; it must be done in a properly organised manner, of course, each person being assigned appropriate work by the local Party organisation and the military authorities.

Non-party people or members of parties other than the Communist Party are naturally not in a position to carry on ideological work against Denikin or Kolchak. But to release them for that reason from all work would be impermissible. Every means must be sought that would compel the whole population (and the *wealthier sections*, both in town and country, in the first place) to contribute their share, in one form or another, to help mobilisation or the mobilised.

Measures to further the quickest and most effective training of the mobilised should form a special category of aid. The Soviet government is calling up all ex-officers,

non-commissioned officers, etc. The Communist Party, as well as all sympathisers and all workers, must assist the workers' and peasants' state, first, by helping to round up all ex-officers, non-commissioned officers, etc., who do not report for service, and, secondly, by organising, under the control of the Party organisation or attached to it, groups of those who have had theoretical or practical (e.g., in the imperialist war) military training and who are capable of doing their share.

WORK AMONG DESERTERS

An obvious change for the better has latterly taken place in the fight against desertion. In a number of gubernias deserters have begun to return to the army en masse; it is no exaggeration to say that deserters are flocking to the Red Army. The reasons are, first, that Party comrades are working more efficiently and systematically, and, secondly, the peasants' growing realisation that Kolchak and Denikin mean the restoration of a regime which is worse than the tsarist, the restoration of *slavery* for the workers and peasants, and of floggings, robbery and insults on the part of the officers and scions of the nobility.

We must therefore everywhere lay special stress on the work among deserters to bring them back into the army, and must *spare no effort* in this work. That is one of the primary and urgent tasks of the day.

Incidentally, the fact that deserters can be influenced by persuasion and that the persuasion can be *effective* shows that the workers' state has a *special* attitude towards the peasants, and in this it differs from the landowner or capitalist state. The rule of the bludgeon or the rule of hunger—that is what constitutes the sole source of discipline of the latter two forms of state. A *different* source of discipline is possible in the case of the workers' state, or the dictatorship of the proletariat—that of persuasion of the peasants by the workers, a comradely alliance between them. When you hear the accounts of eyewitnesses that in such-and-such a gubernia (Ryazan, for instance) thousands upon thousands of deserters are returning voluntarily, that the appeal at meetings to "comrades deserters" sometimes has a success

which beggars all description, you begin to realise how much untapped *strength* there is in this comradely alliance between workers and peasants. The peasant has his *prejudice*, which makes him inclined to support the capitalist, the Socialist-Revolutionary, and "freedom to trade", but he also has his *sound judgement*, which is impelling him more and more towards an alliance with the workers.

DIRECT AID TO THE ARMY

What our army needs most is *supplies*—clothing, footwear, arms, shells. With the country impoverished as it is, an immense effort has to be made to satisfy the army's needs, and it is only the assistance which the capitalist robbers of Britain, France and America are so lavishly rendering Kolchak and Denikin that saves them from inevitable disaster due to shortage of supplies.

But impoverished though Russia is, she still has endless resources which we have not yet utilised, and often have shown *no ability* to utilise. There are still many undisclosed or uninspected military stores, plenty of production potentialities which are being overlooked, partly owing to the deliberate sabotage of officials, partly owing to red tape, bureaucracy, inefficiency and incompetence—all those "sins of the past" which so inevitably and so drastically weigh upon every revolution which makes a "leap" into a new social order.

Direct aid to the army in this respect is particularly important. The institutions in charge of it are particularly in need of "fresh blood", of outside assistance, of the voluntary, vigorous and heroic *initiative* of the workers and peasants *in the localities*.

We must appeal as widely as possible to the initiative of all class-conscious workers and peasants, and of all Soviet officials; we must test in different localities and in different fields of work *different* forms of assistance to the army in this respect. "Work in a revolutionary way" is far less in evidence here than in other spheres, yet "work in a revolutionary way" is needed here *far more*.

The collection of arms from the population is an integral part of this work. It is natural that plenty of arms should

have been hidden by the peasants and the bourgeoisie in a country which has been through four years of imperialist war followed by two people's revolutions—it was inevitable that this should happen. But we must combat it *with all our might* now, in face of Denikin's menacing onslaught. Whoever conceals or helps to conceal arms is guilty of a grave crime against the workers and peasants and deserves to be shot, for he is responsible for the death of thousands upon thousands of the finest Red Army men, who not infrequently perish only because of a shortage of arms at the fronts.

The Petrograd comrades succeeded in unearthing thousands and thousands of rifles when they conducted mass searches in a strictly organised way. The rest of Russia must not lag behind Petrograd and must at all costs overtake and outstrip it.

On the other hand, there is no doubt that the largest numbers of rifles are hidden by the peasants, and often without the least evil intention, but solely from an ingrained distrust of any "state", etc. If we have been able to do much, very much (in the best gubernias) by means of *persuasion*, skilful agitation and a proper approach to get deserters to return to the Red Army voluntarily, there can be no doubt that just as much, if not more, can be done, and should be done, to secure a voluntary return of arms.

Workers and peasants, look for concealed rifles and turn them over to the army! By doing so you will save yourselves from being massacred, shot, flogged wholesale and robbed by Kolchak and Denikin!

CURTAILMENT OF WORK NOT FOR THE WAR

To carry out even a part of the work briefly outlined above we shall need more and more workers, drawn, moreover, from the ranks of the most reliable, devoted and energetic Communists. But where are they to come from, bearing in mind the universal complaints about the dearth of such workers and the over-fatigue they are suffering from?

There can be no doubt that these complaints are largely justified. If anyone were to gauge exactly how thin is that stratum of advanced workers and Communists who with the support and sympathy of the worker and peasant masses

have administered Russia in these last twenty months, it would seem truly incredible. Yet we administered with signal success, building socialism, overcoming unparalleled difficulties, and vanquishing enemies, directly or indirectly connected with the bourgeoisie, that raised their heads everywhere. We have already vanquished all enemies except one—the Entente, the all-powerful imperialist bourgeoisie of Britain, France and America. And we have broken one of the arms of this enemy too—Kolchak. We are only threatened by his other arm—Denikin.

Fresh labour-power for the administration of the state and to carry out the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat are rapidly emerging in the shape of the worker and peasant youth who are most earnestly, zealously and fervidly learning, digesting the new impressions of the new order, throwing off the husk of old, capitalist and bourgeois-democratic prejudices, and moulding themselves into even firmer Communists than the older generation.

But however rapidly this new stratum may be emerging, however rapidly it may be learning and maturing in the fire of the Civil War and the frantic resistance of the bourgeoisie, all the same it cannot, in the next few months, supply us with a *trained* staff for the administration of the state. Yet it is precisely the next few months, the summer and autumn of 1919, that count, for it is essential to *decide* the struggle against Denikin, and it must be done *immediately*.

In order to obtain a large number of well-trained workers to strengthen the war effort we must *reduce in size* a whole number of branches and institutions, not doing war work, or, rather, those not directly connected with the war, but doing Soviet work; we must *reorganise* on these lines (i.e., on the lines of reduction) all institutions and enterprises which are *not absolutely indispensable*.

Take, as a case in point, the Scientific and Technological Department of the Supreme Economic Council. This is a highly valuable institution, one indispensable for the building of full-scale socialism and to account for and distribute all our scientific and technological forces properly. But is such an institution absolutely indispensable? Of course not. To assign to it people who could and should be immedi-

ately employed in urgent and absolutely indispensable communist work *in the army* or *directly* for the army would, at the present juncture, be a downright crime.

There are quite a number of such institutions and departments of institutions in the centre and in the localities. In our efforts to achieve socialism in full we had to begin to set up such institutions immediately. But we would be fools or criminals, if, in the face of Denikin's formidable attack, we were unable to *reform our ranks* in such a way as to *suspend* or *reduce everything* that is not absolutely indispensable.

We must not give way to panic or succumb to the organisational urge and must not reorganise any institutions nor close them down altogether, nor—which is particularly harmful when being done in haste—must we begin to build new institutions. What we must do is to *suspend* for three, four or five months *all* institutions or departments of institutions, both in the centre and in the localities, which are not absolutely indispensable, or, if it is not possible to suspend them altogether, *reduce* them for the same (approximately) period, reduce them to the greatest possible extent, in other words, reduce the work to an absolutely indispensable minimum.

Inasmuch as our main purpose is to secure at once a large number of well-trained, experienced, devoted and tested Communists or socialist sympathisers for military work, we can incur the risk of temporarily leaving many of the heavily curtailed institutions (or departments of institutions) *without a single Communist*, of placing them exclusively in the hands of bourgeois executives. That is not a big risk, for it is only institutions which are not absolutely indispensable that are involved, and while there will certainly be a loss from the weakening of their (semi-suspended) activities, it will not be a great loss, and one which at any rate will not be fatal to us. Whereas insufficient energy in strengthening war work, and strengthening it immediately and considerably, may prove fatal to us. This must be clearly understood and all the necessary conclusions drawn from it.

If every manager of a government department or of a division of a government department in every gubernia, uyezd,

etc., if every Communist nucleus, without losing a moment, asks, is such-and-such an institution, such-and-such a department absolutely indispensable, shall we perish if we suspend it or reduce its activities by nine-tenths and leave no Communists in it at all?—if the posing of this question is followed by speedy and resolute reduction of work and withdrawal of Communists (together with their absolutely reliable assistants among the sympathisers or non-party people), in a very short time we shall have hundreds upon hundreds of persons for work in the political departments of the army, as commissars, etc. And then we shall have a very good chance of defeating Denikin, just as we have defeated the much stronger Kolchak.

WORK IN THE FRONT ZONE

The front zone in the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic has greatly increased in the past few weeks and has undergone an extremely rapid change. This is a harbinger or concomitant of the decisive moment of the war, of its approaching concluding phase.

On the one hand, a vast front zone west of the Urals and in the Ural Mountains proper has become our front zone owing to the victories of the Red Army, the disintegration of Kolchak, and the growth of revolution in Kolchakia. On the other hand, *an even larger zone* near Petrograd and in the South has become a front zone owing to our losses, owing to the immense advance made by the enemy towards Petrograd and the advance from the South into the Ukraine and towards the centre of Russia.

Work in the front zone is assuming cardinal importance.

In the Cis-Urals area, where the Red Army is rapidly advancing, there is a natural desire among army workers—commissars, members of political departments, etc.—as well as among local workers and peasants, to settle down in the newly won localities for constructive Soviet work, a desire which is the more natural, the greater the war fatigue and the more distressful the picture of the destruction wrought by Kolchak. But nothing could be more dangerous than to yield to this desire. It would threaten to weaken our offensive, to retard it, and to increase Kolchak's chances of

recovering his strength. It would be a downright crime against the revolution on our part.

Under no circumstances must a single extra worker be taken from the Eastern Army for local work!* Under no circumstances can the offensive be weakened! The only chance we have of complete victory is for the entire population of the Urals area, who have experienced the horrors of Kolchak "democracy", to take part in it to a man, and to continue the offensive into Siberia until the *complete victory* of the revolution in Siberia.

Let organisational work in the Cis-Urals and the Urals area be delayed, let it proceed less intensively, being done by local, young, inexperienced and weak forces alone. We shall not perish from that. But if we *weaken* the offensive against the Urals and Siberia *we shall perish*. We must *strengthen* that offensive with the forces of the insurgent workers in the Urals, with the forces of the Cis-Urals peasants, who have now learned to their cost the meaning of the "constituent" promises of the Menshevik Maisky and the Socialist-Revolutionary Chernov, and the real meaning of these promises, *i.e.*, *Kolchak*.

To weaken the offensive against the Urals and Siberia would be to betray the revolution, to betray the cause of the emancipation of the workers and peasants from the Kolchak yoke.

It should be remembered in connection with the work in the front zone which has only just been liberated that the main task there is to make not only the workers, but the peasants as well, put their faith in Soviet power, to explain to them in practice that Soviet power means the power of the workers and peasants, and at once to take the right course, the course 'adopted by the Party from the experience of twenty months of work. We must not repeat in the Urals the mistakes which were sometimes made in Great Russia and which we are rapidly learning to avoid.

In the front zone outside Petrograd and in that vast front zone which has been growing so rapidly and menacingly in the Ukraine and in the South, absolutely everything

* Unless there is urgent need none at all should be taken, but people should be transferred from the central gubernias!

must be put on a war footing, and all work, all efforts, all thoughts subordinated to the war and only the war. Otherwise it will be impossible to repulse Denikin's attack. That is clear. And this must be clearly understood and fully put into practice.

Incidentally. A feature of Denikin's army is the large number of officers and Cossacks in it. This is an element which, having no mass force behind it, is extremely likely to engage in swift raids, in gambles, in desperate ventures, with the object of sowing panic and causing destruction for destruction's sake.

In fighting such a foe military discipline and military vigilance of the highest degree are necessary. To be caught napping or to lose one's head means losing everything. Every responsible Party and Soviet worker must bear this in mind.

Military discipline in military and all other matters!

Military vigilance and strictness, and firmness in the adoption of all measures of precaution!

ATTITUDE TOWARDS MILITARY EXPERTS

The vast conspiracy hatched at Krasnaya Gorka and whose purpose was the surrender of Petrograd has again brought forward and with particular emphasis the question of the military experts and of combating counter-revolution in the rear. There can be no doubt that the aggravation of the food and war situation is inevitably stimulating, and will continue to stimulate in the immediate future, still greater efforts by the counter-revolutionaries (in the Petrograd plot there participated the League of Regeneration, Cadets, Mensheviks and Right Socialist-Revolutionaries; the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries also participated, as a separate group, it is true, but they did participate nevertheless). Nor can there be any doubt that the military experts, like the kulaks, the bourgeois intellectuals, the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries, will in the near future give a bigger proportion of traitors.

But it would be an irreparable mistake and unpardonable weakness of character to raise on this account the question

of changing the fundamental principles of our army policy. Hundreds and hundreds of military experts are betraying us and will betray us; we will catch them and shoot them, but thousands and tens of thousands of military experts have been working for us systematically and for a long time, and without them we could not have formed the Red Army, which has grown out of the guerrilla force of evil memory, and has been able to score brilliant victories in the East. Experienced people who head our War Department rightly point out that where the Party policy in regard to the military experts and the extirpation of the guerrilla spirit has been adhered to most strictly, where discipline is firmest, where political work among the troops and the work of the commissars is conducted most thoroughly, there, generally speaking, the number of military experts inclined to betray us is the lowest, there the opportunities for those who are so inclined to carry out their designs are the slightest, there we have no laxity in the army, there its organisation and morale are best, and there we have the most victories. The guerrilla spirit, its vestiges, remnants and survivals have been the cause of immeasurably greater misfortune, disintegration, defeats, disasters and losses in men and military equipment in our army and in the Ukrainian army than all the betrayals of the military experts.

Our Party Programme, both on the general subject of bourgeois experts, and on the particular problem of one of their varieties, the military experts, has defined the policy of the Communist Party with absolute precision. Our Party is waging and will continue to wage "a relentless struggle against the pseudo-radical but actually ignorant and conceited opinion that the working people are capable of overcoming capitalism and the bourgeois social system without learning from bourgeois specialists, without making use of their services and without undergoing the *training of a lengthy period* of work side by side with them".

At the same time, of course, the Party does not make the "slightest political concession to this bourgeois section of the population", the Party suppresses and will continue "ruthlessly to suppress any counter-revolutionary attempts on its part". Naturally, whenever such an "attempt" is made or becomes more or less probable, its "ruthless

suppression" requires other qualities than the deliberateness, the cautiousness of an apprentice, which are demanded for lengthy training, and which the latter inculcates. The contradiction between the attitude of people engaged in the "lengthy period of work side by side" with the military experts, and the attitude of people absorbed in the direct task of "ruthlessly suppressing a counter-revolutionary attempt" of military experts might easily lead, and does lead, to friction and conflict. The same applies to the necessary changes of personnel, the shifting around sometimes of large numbers of military experts which is necessitated by instances of counter-revolutionary "attempts", and all the more by large-scale conspiracies.

We settle, and will continue to settle, such friction and conflicts in the Party way, demanding the same of all the Party organisations and insisting that not the slightest damage to practical work, not the slightest delay in the adoption of essential measures, not a shadow of hesitation in the observance of the established principles of our military policy be tolerated.

If some of our Party bodies adopt an incorrect tone towards the military experts (as was recently the case in Petrograd), or if in some cases "criticism" of military experts turns into direct hindrance to the systematic and persistent work of employing them, the Party immediately rectifies, and will rectify, such mistakes.

The chief and principal means of rectifying them is to intensify political work in the army and among the mobilised, to improve the work of the commissars in the army, to have more highly qualified commissars, to raise their level, to have them carry out *in practice* that which the Party Programme demands and which only too often is carried out far too inadequately, i.e., "the concentration of *all-round* control over the commanders (of the army) in the hands of the working class". Criticism of the military experts by outsiders, attempts to correct matters by "lightning raids" are too easy, and therefore hopeless and harmful. All those who recognise their political responsibility, who take the defects of our army to heart, let them join its ranks, either as privates or commanders, as political workers or commissars; let each work—every Party member will find a place

suited to his abilities—inside the army organisation for its improvement.

The Soviet government has long been paying the greatest attention to making it possible for workers, and also peasants, Communists in particular, to master the art of war in all seriousness. This is being done at a number of establishments, institutions and courses, but still far too little is being done. There is still a lot of room here for personal initiative and personal energy. Communists, in particular, should persistently study the handling of machine-guns, artillery, armoured vehicles, etc., for here our backwardness is more telling, here the enemy's superiority, with his larger number of officers, is greater, here it is possible for an unreliable military expert to do grave harm, here the role of the Communist is important in the extreme.

THE FIGHT AGAINST COUNTER-REVOLUTION IN THE REAR

Counter-revolution is raising its head in our rear and in our midst just as it did in July of last year.

Counter-revolution has been defeated, but by no means destroyed, and is naturally taking advantage of Denikin's victories and of the aggravation of the food shortage. And, as always, in the wake of direct and open counter-revolution, in the wake of the Black Hundreds and the Cadets, whose strength lies in their capital, their direct connections with Entente imperialism, and their understanding of the inevitability of dictatorship and their ability to exercise it (on Kolchak lines) — in their wake follow the wavering, spineless Mensheviks, Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, who embellish their deeds with words.

There should be no illusions on this score! What is the "nutritive medium" which engenders counter-revolutionary activities, outbreaks, conspiracies and so forth we know full well. The medium is the bourgeoisie, the bourgeois intelligentsia, the kulaks in the countryside, and, everywhere, the "non-party" public, as well as the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks. We must redouble, we must increase tenfold our watch over this medium. We

must multiply tenfold our vigilance, because counter-revolutionary attempts from this quarter are absolutely inevitable, precisely at the present moment and in the near future. For this reason, too, repeated attempts to blow up bridges, to foment strikes, to engage in every kind of espionage and the like, are natural. All precautions of the most intense, systematic, repeated, wholesale and unexpected kind are essential in all centres without exception where the "nutritive medium" of the counter-revolutionaries has the least chance of existing.

In regard to the Mensheviks and the Right and Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, we must draw a lesson from our most recent experience. Among their "periphery", among the public which gravitates towards them, there is an undoubted shifting away from Kolchak and Denikin towards Soviet power. We have taken cognisance of this shift, and every time it has assumed any real shape we, on our part, have taken a step to meet it. This policy of ours we shall not change under any circumstances, and generally speaking, there will no doubt be an increase in the number of "migrants" from the type of Menshevism and Socialist-Revolutionarism which leans towards Kolchak and Denikin to the type of Menshevism and Socialist-Revolutionarism which leans towards Soviet power.

But at the present juncture the petty-bourgeois democrats, headed by the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks, spineless and wavering as always, are watching to see which way the wind blows, and are swinging in the direction of the victor, Denikin. This is especially true of the "political leaders" of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, of the Mensheviks (of the type of Martov and Co.), of the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries (of the type of Chernov and Co.), and of their "literary groups" in general, whose members, apart from all else, are deeply offended at their political bankruptcy, and for whom hazardous ventures *against* Soviet power, therefore, have an attraction that is hardly likely to be eradicated.

We must not allow ourselves to be deceived by the words and ideology of their leaders, by their personal integrity or hypocrisy. This is important from the standpoint of their individual biographies. But it is not important from

the standpoint of politics, i.e., of the relations between classes, of the relations between millions of people. Martov and Co., "in the name of the Central Committee", solemnly condemn their "activists" and threaten (eternally threaten!) to expel them from the party. But this by no means does away with the fact that the "activists" are the strongest of all among the Mensheviks, hide behind them, and carry on their work on behalf of Kolchak and Denikin. Volsky and Co. condemn Avksentyev, Chernov and Co., but this does not in the least prevent the latter from being stronger than Volsky, nor does it prevent Chernov from saying, "If it is not we who are to overthrow the Bolsheviks, and not now, then who is, and when?" The Left Socialist-Revolutionaries may "work independently" without any agreement with the reactionaries, with the Chernovs, but actually they are just as much allies of Denikin and pawns in *his* game as the late Left Socialist-Revolutionary Muravyov, the ex-commander-in-chief, who for "ideological" reasons opened the front to the Czechoslovaks and to Kolchak.

Martov, Volsky and Co. fancy themselves "superior" to both contending sides; they fancy themselves capable of creating a "third side".

This desire, even when it is sincere, still remains the illusion of the petty-bourgeois democrat, who to this day, seventy years after 1848, has still not learned the most elementary thing, namely, that in a capitalist environment only the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie or the dictatorship of the proletariat is possible, and that no third course can exist. Martov and Co. will evidently die with this illusion. That is their affair. And it is our affair to remember that in practice vacillations on the part of these people are inevitable, today in the direction of Denikin, tomorrow in the direction of the Bolsheviks. And today we must do the task of *this* day.

Our task is to put the question bluntly. What is better? To ferret out, to imprison, sometimes even to shoot hundreds of traitors from among the Cadets, non-party people, Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, who "come out" (some with arms in hand, others with conspiracies, others still with agitation against mobilisation, like the Menshevik printers and railwaymen, etc.) *against* Soviet power,

in other words, in favour of Denikin? Or to allow matters to reach such a pass that Kolchak and Denikin are able to slaughter, shoot and flog to death tens of thousands of workers and peasants? The choice is not difficult to make.

That is how the question stands, and not otherwise.

Whoever has not yet understood this, whoever is capable of whining over the "iniquity" of such a decision, must be given up as hopeless and held up to public ridicule and shame.

THE POPULATION MUST BE MOBILISED FOR WAR TO A MAN

The Soviet Republic is a fortress besieged by world capital. We can concede the right to use it as a refuge from Kolchak, and the right to live in it generally, only to those who take an active part in the war and help us in every way. Hence our right and our duty to mobilise the whole population for the war to a man, some for army work in the direct meaning of the term, others for subsidiary activities of every kind in aid of the war.

To carry this out in full, an ideal organisation is required. And since our government organisation is very far from perfect (which is not in the least surprising in view of its youth, its novelty and the extraordinary difficulties which accompany its development), to attempt at once and on a wide scale anything complete or even very considerable in this sphere would be a most dangerous indulgence in fantastic organisational schemes.

But much can be done in a partial way to bring us nearer to this ideal, and the "initiative" shown by our Party workers and Soviet officials in this respect is very, very far from enough.

It will suffice here to raise this question and to draw the attention of comrades to it. There is no need to give any specific instructions or proposals.

Let us only observe that the petty-bourgeois democrats who stand nearest to the Soviets and who call themselves, by force of habit, socialists—some of the "Left" Mensheviks and the like, for example—are particularly disposed to wax

indignant at the "barbaric", in their opinion, practice of taking hostages.

Let them wax indignant, but unless this is done war cannot be waged, and when the danger grows acute the use of this means must be extended and multiplied in every sense. Not infrequently, for instance, Menshevik or yellow printers, higher railway employees or secret profiteers, kulaks, the wealthy sections of the urban (and rural) population and similar elements look upon defence against Kolchak and Denikin with an infinitely criminal and infinitely brazen attitude of indifference which grows into sabotage. Lists of such groups must be drawn up (or they must be compelled themselves to form groups in which each answers for everybody), and they must not only be put to work digging trenches, as is sometimes practised, but assigned to the most diverse and comprehensive duties for material aid to the Red Army.

The fields of the Red Army men will be better cultivated, the supply of food, tobacco and other necessities to the Red Army men will be better arranged, the danger to the lives of thousands upon thousands of workers and peasants resulting from a single conspiracy, etc., will be considerably reduced if we employ this method more widely, more comprehensively and more skilfully.

"WORK IN A REVOLUTIONARY WAY"

Summing up what was said above, we arrive at a simple conclusion. What is demanded immediately and in the course of the next few months of all Communists, of all class-conscious workers and peasants, of everyone who does not want to see Kolchak and Denikin win, is an extraordinary accession of energy; what is needed is "work in a revolutionary way".

The starving, exhausted and worn-out Moscow railwaymen, both skilled and unskilled, have for the sake of victory over Kolchak inaugurated "communist subbotniks"—work without pay for several hours a week to continue until victory over Kolchak is complete—and have, moreover, developed unprecedented labour productivity, exceeding the

usual productivity many times over; this goes to show that much, very much can still be done.

And we must do it.

Then we shall win.

*Central Committee
of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks)*

Written not later
than July 3, 1919

Published in the *Bulletin*
of the C.C., R.C.P.(B.)
No. 4, July 9, 1919

Published according to
the *Bulletin*, verified with
a typewritten copy bearing
Lenin's corrections

THE PRESENT SITUATION AND THE IMMEDIATE TASKS OF SOVIET POWER

REPORT DELIVERED TO A JOINT MEETING OF THE ALL-RUSSIA
CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, THE MOSCOW SOVIET OF WORKERS'
AND RED ARMY DEPUTIES, THE ALL-RUSSIA COUNCIL OF TRADE
UNIONS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF MOSCOW FACTORY COMMITTEES
JULY 4, 1919¹

Comrades, when one is confronted with the task of assessing our general situation as it now is, the idea enters one's head, whether one wishes it or not, of comparing July 1919 with July 1918. I think that such a comparison, which naturally suggests itself, can best give us a true conception of those new difficulties—to a certain extent they are also old difficulties—which have grown up and have made our situation a burdensome one demanding a fresh effort; on the other hand this comparison shows us the tremendous step forward that has been made by the world revolution in that year and tells us why, taking a most sober, even a most sceptical view of affairs, we again are quite confident that we are advancing to the complete and final victory.

Recall the situation a year ago, comrades. It was in July 1918 that the menacing black clouds had gathered and that seemingly insurmountable misfortunes threatened the Soviet Republic. The food situation, then as today, had become graver at the end of the farming year, when stocks were running short and the new harvest had not been gathered. Last year the situation was incomparably worse. Then, as today, serious political and war difficulties, both at home and abroad, were added to the food difficulties. The meeting of the Congress of Soviets last year coincided with the revolt of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries in Moscow and the trea-

son of Muravyov, a Left Socialist-Revolutionary then in command of the army, who left our front almost open. In the summer of 1918 there was the gigantic plot in Yaroslavl which, as has now been proved and is admitted by those participating, was due to the activities of French Ambassador Noulens, who persuaded Savinkov to organise the plot with a guarantee that the French troops landed at Archangel would come to the aid of Yaroslavl and that in the most difficult situation in Yaroslavl the town could expect to link with Archangel and the Allies and, consequently, could expect the early fall of Moscow. At that time the enemy succeeded in capturing Samara, Kazan, Simbirsk, Syzran and Saratov in the East. In the South, Cossack troops reinforced by German imperialism—this has been fully established—obtained money and munitions. The enemy launched an offensive, closed in on us from two sides and began to poke fun at us. From German imperialist quarters it was said that if we could not defeat the Czechoslovaks how could we hope to defeat them. Such was the insolent tone adopted by the imperialists.

Such was the seemingly hopeless way in which the Soviet Republic was surrounded at a time of unprecedented food troubles, at a time when our army was only just beginning to take shape. The army lacked organisation and experience and we had to get it together hastily, contingent by contingent, when systematic, integrated work was out of the question. We lived through that year and, relying on the experience gained and never once forgetting the past, we have every right to say today that although the situation is indeed a difficult one, if we compare what we experienced last year with the present situation—anyone who wishes to make a careful study of it, observe and not give way to his own moods will have no doubts about it—we shall see that our present situation is incomparably more stable even from the point of view of the simple internal balance of forces, even by comparing the facts bearing on our temporary difficulties, and to give way to panic would be criminal a thousand times over. A year ago the situation was incomparably more difficult yet those difficulties were surmounted, so that we may say with absolute confidence and without any exaggeration of our forces or underestimation of our difficulties

that we shall also surmount our present difficulties. I must give you the main comparable figures and speakers who follow me will deal with the question in greater detail.

When the food situation became acute last summer, things were so bad that in July and August there was literally nothing in the warehouses of the Commissariat of Food, the organisation which deals with food supplies, nothing which could be issued to the most war-weary, the most tormented and the most hungry people of the towns and the non-agricultural districts. This year our food distribution machinery has made a tremendous advance. During the year from August 1, 1917 to August 1, 1918 we procured only 30 million poods of grain but between August 1, 1918 and May 1, 1919 we procured as much as 100 million poods. This is very little compared with what we need, and it shows that to win a victory in the struggle for food there are millions of organisational obstacles that have to be overcome; they are being erected against us by every peasant who has grain surpluses and who is used to trading in a free market and who considers it his sacred right to sell grain at uncontrolled prices; this peasant is unable to understand that at such a time, when the country is fighting against Russian and international capital, trading in grain is the most serious state crime. It is a mockery of the poor and the hungry, it is the best service he could do the capitalist and the profiteer. We know that every peasant who has earned his livelihood by toil, sweat and blood, by bending his back, understands what capitalism is. He sympathises with the proletariat, even if only hazily, instinctively, because he believes that the proletariat are devoting their whole lives and forfeiting their blood to overthrow capital. But he will have to make tremendous progress from this level before he is able to uphold the interests of the socialist state and to place those interests higher than the interests of the huckster who wants to profit right now while he can sell grain at unheard-of, unprecedented prices. We are now beginning to get the measure of it. We have made part of the journey and, therefore, know for certain that no matter how difficult and tortuous the road, we are capable of surmounting the difficulties. We have made considerable progress as compared with last year but we have not yet solved all prob-

lems. We cannot promise an immediate improvement, but we know that the situation offers much greater hopes; we now know at any rate that our resources are not cut off as they were last year by Cossack gangs in the South-East, by German imperialism in the South-West and by the Czechoslovaks in the grain-producing East. The situation is much better so that we shall be able to live through and overcome the next few weeks that will undoubtedly bring fresh burdens and claim fresh sacrifices knowing that we did it last year, knowing that our situation is better, knowing that we already have practical experience of the chief difficulty of any socialist revolution, the food difficulty. And we really can say, without relying on assumptions and hopes, but on the basis of our own practical experience, that we have learned to tackle this difficulty and will learn to surmount it.

If you take the present war situation in which the Allies collapsed when they seized the Ukraine after the Germans and when they had Odessa and Sevastopol, we see that the threat which seemed irrevocable to the mass of the petty bourgeoisie and to the scared philistines turned out to be an empty one, that it was nothing more than a giant with feet of clay. They did everything they could to help the whiteguards, landowners and capitalists with arms and ammunition. The British newspapers—and British ministers, too—boasted openly that they had sent reinforcements to Denikin. We have received information that they have sent equipment for 250,000 men and have provided all the arms. We have also received information, and it has been confirmed, to the effect that they have sent dozens of tanks. That made possible the severe attacks by Denikin that were launched at a time when the enemy was pressing on us from the East. We know the difficult time we experienced last July. We do not in the least underestimate the danger and do not close our eyes to the fact that we must go openly to the masses, we must tell them what the situation is, tell them the whole truth and open their eyes, because the more this truth is known to the workers and particularly to the peasants—it is very difficult to convince peasants of the truth—the more determinedly, more steadfastly and class-consciously will they come over to our side. (*Applause.*)

In the Central Committee, comrades, we yesterday decided that Comrade Trotsky would make the report to you on the war situation. Unfortunately the doctors today forbade him absolutely to make that report. I shall, therefore, outline the situation in a few words, although I cannot by any means claim the role of *rapporteur* on these matters; I can, however, tell in brief outline, comrades, what we heard yesterday from Comrade Trotsky who had made a tour of the Southern Front.

The situation there is truly a grave one, extremely heavy attacks have been launched against us and we have suffered huge losses. There is a double reason for our failures. Yes, just two reasons; first, we had to withdraw large numbers of troops and transfer them as reinforcements to the East at a time when Kolchak was attacking. Precisely at this time Denikin carried out universal mobilisation. It is true, as one of the members of the Revolutionary Council of the Southern Front who has been working there a long time told us, that universal mobilisation will be the ruin of Denikin as it was of Kolchak; as long as he had a class army of volunteers who hated socialism it was strong and sound, but when he began universal recruitment he did, of course, get an army together more quickly, but the army became the weaker, and its class character less pronounced. Peasants recruited into Denikin's army will do the same in that army as the Siberian peasants did in Kolchak's army—they brought complete disintegration into the army.

Another reason for the failures, apart from the tremendous increase in Denikin's army, was the development of guerrilla methods on the Southern Front. Comrade Trotsky also described this in detail yesterday. You all know what our armies experienced as a result of Grigoriev's adventure, which resulted from Makhno's banditry and what the Ukrainian peasants and the entire Ukrainian proletariat experienced during the rule of the Hetman. In the Ukraine, owing to the low level of proletarian class-consciousness, owing to weakness and lack of organisation, owing to Petlyura's disorganising tactics and the pressure of German imperialism—on these grounds hostility and guerrilla tactics have emerged spontaneously. In every group the peasants were taking up arms, electing their own ataman, or

"father", to set up an authority, to create it on the spot. They paid no attention whatever to the central authorities and every "father" thought he was the boss on the spot, that he alone could settle all Ukrainian problems, disregarding what was being done at the centre. It is now quite clear to us that in the present circumstances the peasants cannot be won over by enthusiasm alone—such a method is not reliable. We have warned the Ukrainian comrades a thousand times that when it is a matter of the movement of million-strong masses words are not enough; they must have their own day-to-day experience so that people can verify instructions themselves, so that they believe in their own experience. This experience has cost the Ukrainian peasants very dear. During the German occupation they suffered incredible misfortunes, made unbelievable sacrifices, many times greater than what we experienced; nevertheless they still do not know how to achieve an organisation and how to win their independence and state sovereignty. In the first period after the liberation from German imperialism, when Denikin's gangs began to gain strength, our troops did not always deal them a suitable rebuff, and when our troops were held up by the rapid swelling of the rivers in spring, when it was impossible to advance and no reinforcements came from here, there arrived that catastrophic moment in which the first blow fell on the Ukrainian peasantry as a whole and on the peasantry of the zone contiguous to the Ukraine and the Don, but which will fortunately cure them of the defects of guerrilla tactics and chaos. We know full well that the Ukrainian peasants are strong enough to defeat Denikin's forces, and we know that the blows they have received are very grave and will arouse in them a new class-consciousness and fresh strength. And 'Comrade Trotsky who himself saw the incredible losses suffered there, stated definitely that the experience of the Ukrainians cannot pass without leaving a trace, that it would bring about a complete change in the entire psychology of the Ukrainian peasants—is that not what we have experienced? We know that our situation was no better last year. We know that a number of countries looked upon us, the young Russian republic, with contempt, and that today the same thing is beginning in many countries, the same phenomena are to be observed.

The Ukraine is recuperating with greater difficulty than we did, but she is recuperating. The lessons of collapse, of guerrilla tactics, have been assimilated. This will be an epoch of change in the entire Ukrainian revolution, and that will influence the entire development of the Ukraine. This is the period of change we, too, experienced when we turned our backs on guerrilla tactics and the scattering of revolutionary phrases—we can do anything!—and began to realise the need for sound, sustained, persistent and difficult organising activities. This was the road we took many months after the October Revolution and on which we have achieved considerable success. We look towards the future fully confident that we shall surmount all difficulties.

One of the circumstances that Comrade Trotsky spoke of as being clear evidence of the change is what he observed in respect of deserters. He visited many gubernias where the comrades we had sent to combat desertion from the army had met with no success. He spoke himself at meetings and saw that tens of thousands of deserters in this country had either given way to panic or were trailing along too easily in the wake of the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless we had been ready to draw conclusions that were tantamount to despair. Trotsky, who travelled through Kursk and Ryazan, was convinced, on the example of a number of towns, that the change that had taken place in this sphere was beyond description. Some commissars said they were now swamped with deserters pouring into the Red Army. They are joining the Red Army in such numbers that we can suspend our mobilisation as the ranks are filled by old deserters returning to the army.

The peasants have seen what campaigns by the Cossacks and by Denikin mean, and the masses of peasants have begun to show a double degree of class-consciousness—they had wanted an immediate peace and had been unable to understand that the Civil War had been forced on us. The peasants did everything they could to avoid enlistment—they hid in the woods or joined the green bands* and there tried to ig-

* Gangs of bandits in the Ukraine who engaged in plunder under cover of political slogans against Reds and Whites during the Civil War.—*Ed.*

nore everything else. This is the state of affairs that led to collapse in the Ukraine; this was the state of affairs that gave us many thousands of deserters. Trotsky spoke about the change that took place when we granted the deserters a longer period in which to report, when we approached the problem more boldly. Hundreds of comrades turned up for work in Ryazan Gubernia and the change took place. They attended the meeting and deserters poured into the Red Army. The local commissars say they could not keep pace with them. This is the circumstance connected with the recapture of Liski railway station which strengthened our positions at Kursk and Voronezh. This circumstance gave Trotsky reason to say that the position in the South was serious and that we should bend all efforts. I maintain, however, that *the situation is not catastrophic*. That is the conclusion we arrived at yesterday. (*Applause.*)

That conclusion is not open to doubt and we shall do everything to exert all our efforts; we are sure the class-consciousness of the working masses will triumph for we have the experience of the Ukraine which tells us that the closer Denikin approaches and the clearer it becomes what he and the capitalists and landowners are bringing, the easier will it be for us to combat desertion and the more boldly can we offer the deserters a further week in which to report. The day before yesterday the Council of Defence extended the period by a further week because we are now fully confident that the class-consciousness that Denikin is bringing them will not be wasted and the Red Army will continue to grow if we remember that all our efforts during the next few months must be devoted to war work. We must tell you that we shall now help the South and achieve victory there in the same way as we did in the East. There may be people who give way to moods, comrades, those most inclined to panic, who will ask whether we shall not lose what we have gained in the East if we turn our main attention to the South. As far as this is concerned we may say that the conquests made by our troops in the East will, by all accounts, merge with the Siberian revolution. (*Applause.*)

Yesterday a certain Menshevik made a speech in Moscow. You can read Citizen Golosov's report in *Izvestia*; he said that the Mensheviks were leaving for Siberia, believing that

there was a Constituent Assembly and the power of the people there, that universal suffrage and the will of the people ruled, and not some dictatorship of one class, usurpation, violence—as they dub Soviet power. The experience of these people, who flirted with Kerensky for eight months and who gave up everything to Kornilov, who learned nothing and went over to Kolchak—experience has now shown that it was not the Bolsheviks, but the enemies of the Bolsheviks, people who devoted all their activities to the struggle against the Bolsheviks and travelled hundreds of versts to do it, who drew the conclusions that we have heard and which the public learned from the reports of the Mensheviks, conclusions that show that the Mensheviks have repelled not only the workers but the peasants as well, and not only the peasants, but even the kulaks. Even the kulaks are rebelling against Kolchak! (*Applause.*) None of those descriptions of the revolts against Kolchak's rule was in the least bit exaggerated. Not merely workers and peasants, but also patriotically-minded intellectuals, who had all formerly sabotaged our work and who had been allies of the Entente—Kolchak has repelled even them. We are now being told that an insurrection is under way in the Urals, that we have before us an instance of a real workers' uprising; and again we say that there is every chance that victory in the Urals will be a turn towards the complete victory of the entire mass of the Siberian population over Kolchak's government, and that there are grounds for expecting it within the next few months.

Comrades, you read of the capture of Motovilikha in yesterday's newspapers—this is where the Urals factory district begins. The details of the capture of Perm, where several regiments came over to our side, confirm it, and every day we are receiving telegram after telegram indicating that a decisive turning-point has been reached in the Urals. This is corroborated by a telegram I received today from Ufa dated July 2. We have more detailed information which gives us good grounds to assert that a decisive turning-point has been reached and we shall be victorious in the Urals. By the capture of Perm and then of Motovilikha we have achieved a great deal; they are big factory centres where the workers are organising, are coming over to our

side in hundreds and are cutting the railway lines in the rear of the enemy. Probably few of you have had an opportunity of seeing Kolchak's people, workers and peasants who have come from there, but we should like people in Moscow to see more of those who come from there. Were not the Cis-Urals and Siberian peasants ready to turn their backs on the Bolsheviks a year ago? They were discontented and indignant at the Bolsheviks for demanding help in a difficult war and for saying "victory over the landowners and capitalists is not easily won and if they make war on you, you must be prepared to make every sacrifice to defend the gains of the revolution. Revolutions are not easily made, and if you find these sacrifices too much for you, if you have not enough stamina to make these sacrifices, you will ruin the revolution". The peasants did not want to listen to this, they thought it was nothing more than a revolutionary appeal. When the other side offered peace and the help of the Entente they went over to that side. You realise, of course, that the Siberian peasants have never experienced serfdom. They are the best-fed peasants in Russia, they are used to exploiting people exiled from Russia; they are peasants who could not see that there would be anything to gain from the revolution, and these peasants got their leaders from the entire Russian bourgeoisie, from all the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries—there were hundreds, thousands of them there. Some people put the present population of Omsk, for instance, at 900,000 bourgeois and others at 500,000. Literally all the bourgeoisie got together there, all those who claimed the right to lead the people because of their possession of knowledge and culture and their habit of ruling—people of all parties, from the Mensheviks to the Socialist-Revolutionaries, gathered there. They had well-fed peasants, solid men not inclined to socialism, they had aid from all the Entente countries, from the all-powerful countries that held power in their hands throughout the world. They had railway lines with free access to the sea, and that meant complete mastery, for the flag of the Allies has no rival anywhere in the world and rules over the entire globe. What else was wanting? Why was it that these people who had everything that was to be had against the Bolsheviks—a country with strong, solid

peasants and the aid of the Entente—why did they collapse so badly after two years' experience that all that was left in place of the "power of the people" was the barbaric rule of the sons of landowners and capitalists? Kolchakia broke down completely, and this is actually tangible when our Red Army approaches the Urals as the liberator. A year ago the peasants were shouting, "Down with the Bolsheviks, they put burdens on the shoulders of the peasants", and they went over to the side of the landowners and capitalists. At that time they did not believe what we told them; now they have experienced for themselves, now they have seen that the Bolsheviks took one horse away from a peasant whereas the Kolchak people took everything, the horses and everything else, and re-introduced tsarist discipline. Now that the peasants have the experience of the past they welcome the Red Army as their deliverer and say that sound and complete liberty will come to Siberia together with the Bolsheviks. (*Applause.*)

This experience of Kolchakia is a most valuable experience for us; it shows us on a small scale what is going on all over the world, it shows us the real sources—sources that are invincible, sources that are ineradicable—of the strength of the Bolsheviks. We had seemed helpless when Siberia was in the hands of our enemies. Now that gigantic power has collapsed. Why? Because we were right in our appraisal of the imperialist war and its consequences, we were right when we said that mankind would not emerge from this as it had from previous wars—people had suffered so much, had been tormented so much, were so full of wrath against capitalism that the rule of the working class would set in and socialism would be established. The "middle way" has been mentioned here, and I know very well that the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks dream of that middle way, that the best people in those intermediate parties dream sincerely of that middle way, but we know from the experience of whole countries and peoples that it is an empty dream, because there is no middle way in the kingdom of the Constituent Assembly where the Chernovs and Maiskys again began their ministerial careers and were a complete failure. Is this an accident or Bolshevik slander? Nobody will believe that it is! If they started out with such

faith in the Constituent Assembly and ended up with such a failure it only goes to show once again that the Bolsheviks are right when they say that there must be either the dictatorship of the proletariat, the dictatorship of all working people and a victory over capitalism, or the most filthy and sanguinary rule of the bourgeoisie, even going as far as a monarchy established by Kolchak, as in Siberia. And now I can go over from the lessons and conclusions drawn from Siberia to a brief outline of the international situation.

Comrades, we have made tremendous progress in our internal policy; millions of Russian peasants who a year ago had an absolutely unenlightened view of the wide world, who believed any glib talk about the Constituent Assembly, who lost heart on account of the burdens imposed by Bolshevism, who ran away every time there was an appeal to struggle—since then the peasants have had such an incredibly burdensome and sanguinary experience at the hands of the Germans in the South that they have learned a lot. We have become infinitely strong because millions of people have realised what Kolchak is; millions of peasants in Siberia have come over to Bolshevism—they are waiting for the Bolsheviks, literally all of them—not because of our sermons and doctrines, but because of their own experience; they called for the Socialist-Revolutionaries and put them in power but from their having placed the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks in power they got the old Russian monarchy, the old Russian policeman, who introduced incredible lawlessness into the country together with the “democracy”. This cure of the people, however, is worth a lot. (*Applause*).

Take a glance at the world situation. Have we not made a tremendous step forward in this respect during the past year when we compare it with what we had a year ago? Did not even people devoted to the revolution turn against us at that time, did they not say that the Bolsheviks had sold Russia to the German predators, that the Brest peace had demonstrated what a serious mistake had been made, and did they not believe that only the alliance of democratic France and Britain would save Russia? And what happened? A few months after last year's crisis the Brest peace had ceased to exist. Six months passed after November 9,

1918, when Germany was defeated, and it took that six months' effort on the part of the French and British imperialists to conclude peace. And what did the peace bring? What it gave was this: all the workers who had until then been on the side of the champions of the French and British imperialists who had preached war to the end, all of them are now coming over to our side, not even day by day but hour by hour; they tell themselves that they had been deceived into waging war for four years. They had been promised the defeat of Germany in the name of liberty, the victory of liberty and equality, the victory of democracy, and instead of it they had been given the Treaty of Versailles, an unworthily imposed peace for the purpose of plunder and profit. During that year our situation has been one of intense struggle for the victory of the world revolution. And our situation, if you compare it to that of the enemies, has been such that we have acquired ever more allies throughout the world at every step we have taken. We now see that what the Germans, from their imperialist point of view consider a defeat, that what the French and British consider a full victory—we see that this is the beginning of the end for the French and British imperialists. The working-class movement is growing faster and faster. The workers are demanding the withdrawal of foreign troops from Russia and the annulment of the Treaty of Versailles. We were alone at the time of the Treaty of Brest; it was swept away and its place was taken by the Treaty of Versailles that is strangling Germany.

In appraising the last year's experience, in recognising frankly all difficulties, we are able to say to you calmly, confidently and soberly, "Comrades, we have come again and again to outline to you the general situation and to picture to the advanced workers of Moscow those difficulties that we have again come up against; we invite you to give some thought to the lessons we have learned in this difficult period and on the basis of your thinking and your appraisal, on the basis of this experience, reach, together with us, the firm and unshakable conviction that victory will be ours, on a world and not only on a Russian scale. Again and again we shall muster our forces to make up for the defeats we have suffered in the South. We shall put

forward the tried and tested weapons of organisational ability, discipline and loyalty, and then we are certain that Denikin will be broken, and will collapse in the same way as Kolchak has collapsed and the French and British imperialists are now collapsing. (*Stormy applause.*)

Brief report published in
Pravda No. 145, July 5, 1919

Published according to
the verbatim report,
verified with the *Pravda* text

THE STATE

A LECTURE DELIVERED AT THE SVERDLOV UNIVERSITY
JULY 11, 1919"

Comrades, according to the plan you have adopted and which has been conveyed to me, the subject of today's talk is the state. I do not know how familiar you are already with this subject. If I am not mistaken your courses have only just begun and this is the first time you will be tackling this subject systematically. If that is so, then it may very well happen that in the first lecture on this difficult subject I may not succeed in making my exposition sufficiently clear and comprehensible to many of my listeners. And if this should prove to be the case, I would request you not to be perturbed by the fact, because the question of the state is a most complex and difficult one, perhaps one that more than any other has been confused by bourgeois scholars, writers and philosophers. It should not therefore be expected that a thorough understanding of this subject can be obtained from one brief talk, at a first sitting. After the first talk on this subject you should make a note of the passages which you have not understood or which are not clear to you, and return to them a second, a third and a fourth time, so that what you have not understood may be further supplemented and elucidated later, both by reading and by various lectures and talks. I hope that we may manage to meet once again and that we shall then be able to exchange opinions on all supplementary questions and see what has remained most unclear. I also hope that in addition to talks and lectures you will devote some time to reading at least a few of the most important works of Marx and Engels. I have

no doubt that these most important works are to be found in the lists of books and in the handbooks which are available in your library for the students of the Soviet and Party school; and although, again, some of you may at first be dismayed by the difficulty of the exposition, I must again warn you that you should not let this worry you; what is unclear at a first reading will become clear at a second reading, or when you subsequently approach the question from a somewhat different angle. For I once more repeat that the question is so complex and has been so confused by bourgeois scholars and writers that anybody who desires to study it seriously and master it independently must attack it several times, return to it again and again and consider it from various angles in order to attain a clear, sound understanding of it. Because it is such a fundamental, such a basic question in all politics, and because not only in such stormy and revolutionary times as the present, but even in the most peaceful times, you will come across it every day in any newspaper in connection with any economic or political question it will be all the easier to return to it. Every day, in one context or another, you will be returning to the question: what is the state, what is its nature, what is its significance and what is the attitude of our Party, the party that is fighting for the overthrow of capitalism, the Communist Party—what is its attitude to the state? And the chief thing is that you should acquire, as a result of your reading, as a result of the talks and lectures you will hear on the state, the ability to approach this question independently, since you will be meeting with it on the most diverse occasions, in connection with the most trifling questions, in the most unexpected contexts and in discussions and disputes with opponents. Only when you learn to find your way about independently in this question may you consider yourself sufficiently confirmed in your convictions and able with sufficient success to defend them against anybody and at any time.

After these brief remarks, I shall proceed to deal with the question itself—what is the state, how did it arise and fundamentally what attitude to the state should be displayed by the party of the working class, which is fighting for the complete overthrow of capitalism—the Communist Party?

I have already said that you are not likely to find another question which has been so confused, deliberately and unwittingly, by representatives of bourgeois science, philosophy, jurisprudence, political economy and journalism, as the question of the state. To this day it is very often confused with religious questions; not only those professing religious doctrines (it is quite natural to expect it of them), but even people who consider themselves free from religious prejudice, very often confuse the specific question of the state with questions of religion and endeavour to build up a doctrine—very often a complex one, with an ideological, philosophical approach and argumentation—which claims that the state is something divine, something supernatural, that it is a certain force by virtue of which mankind has lived, that it is a force of divine origin which confers on people, or can confer on people, or which brings with it something that is not of man, but is given him from without. And it must be said that this doctrine is so closely bound up with the interests of the exploiting classes—the landowners and the capitalists—so serves their interests, has so deeply permeated all the customs, views and science of the gentlemen who represent the bourgeoisie, that you will meet with vestiges of it on every hand, even in the view of the state held by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, although they are convinced that they can regard the state with sober eyes and reject indignantly the suggestion that they are under the sway of religious prejudices. This question has been so confused and complicated because it affects the interests of the ruling classes more than any other question (yielding place in this respect only to the foundations of economic science). The doctrine of the state serves to justify social privilege, the existence of exploitation, the existence of capitalism—and that is why it would be the greatest mistake to expect impartiality on this question, to approach it in the belief that people who claim to be scientific can give you a purely scientific view on the subject. In the question of the state, in the doctrine of the state, in the theory of the state, when you have become familiar with it and have gone into it deeply enough, you will always discern the struggle between different classes, a struggle which is reflected or expressed in a conflict

of views on the state, in the estimate of the role and significance of the state.

To approach this question as scientifically as possible we must cast at least a fleeting glance back on the history of the state, its emergence and development. The most reliable thing in a question of social science, and one that is most necessary in order really to acquire the habit of approaching this question correctly and not allowing oneself to get lost in the mass of detail or in the immense variety of conflicting opinion—the most important thing if one is to approach this question scientifically is not to forget the underlying historical connection, to examine every question from the standpoint of how the given phenomenon arose in history and what were the principal stages in its development, and, from the standpoint of its development, to examine what it has become today.

I hope that in studying this question of the state you will acquaint yourselves with Engels's book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. This is one of the fundamental works of modern socialism, every sentence of which can be accepted with confidence, in the assurance that it has not been said at random but is based on immense historical and political material. Undoubtedly, not all the parts of this work have been expounded in an equally popular and comprehensible way; some of them presume a reader who already possesses a certain knowledge of history and economics. But I again repeat that you should not be perturbed if on reading this work you do not understand it at once. Very few people do. But returning to it later, when your interest has been aroused, you will succeed in understanding the greater part, if not the whole of it. I refer to this book because it gives the correct approach to the question in the sense mentioned. It begins with a historical sketch of the origin of the state.

This question, like every other—for example, that of the origin of capitalism, the exploitation of man by man, socialism, how socialism arose, what conditions gave rise to it—can be approached soundly and confidently only if we cast a glance back on the history of its development as a whole. In connection with this problem it should first of all be noted that the state has not always existed. There

was a time when there was no state. It appears wherever and whenever a division of society into classes appears, whenever exploiters and exploited appear.

Before the first form of exploitation of man by man arose, the first form of division into classes—slave-owners and slaves—there existed the patriarchal family, or, as it is sometimes called, the *clan* family. (Clan—tribe; at the time people of one kin lived together.) Fairly definite traces of these primitive times have survived in the life of many primitive peoples; and if you take any work whatsoever on primitive civilisation, you will always come across more or less definite descriptions, indications and recollections of the fact that there was a time, more or less similar to primitive communism, when the division of society into slave-owners and slaves did not exist. And in those times there was no state, no special apparatus for the systematic application of force and the subjugation of people by force. It is such an apparatus that is called the state.

In primitive society, when people lived in small family groups and were still at the lowest stages of development, in a condition approximating to savagery—an epoch from which modern, civilised human society is separated by several thousand years—there were yet no signs of the existence of a state. We find the predominance of custom, authority, respect, the power enjoyed by the elders of the clan; we find this power sometimes accorded to women—the position of women then was not like the downtrodden and oppressed condition of women today—but nowhere do we find a special *category* of people set apart to rule others and who, for the sake and purpose of rule, systematically and permanently have at their disposal a certain apparatus of coercion, an apparatus of violence, such as is represented at the present time, as you all realise, by armed contingents of troops, prisons and other means of subjugating the will of others by force—all that which constitutes the essence of the state.

If we get away from what are known as religious teachings, from the subtleties, philosophical arguments and various opinions advanced by bourgeois scholars, if we get away from these and try to get at the real core of the matter, we shall find that the state really does amount to such an apparatus of

rule which stands outside society as a whole. When there appears such a special group of men occupied solely with government, and who in order to rule need a special apparatus of coercion to subjugate the will of others by force—prisons, special contingents of men, armies, etc.—then there appears the state.

But there was a time when there was no state, when general ties, the community itself, discipline and the ordering of work were maintained by force of custom and tradition, by the authority or the respect enjoyed by the elders of the clan or by women—who in those times not only frequently enjoyed a status equal to that of men, but not infrequently enjoyed an even higher status—and when there was no special category of persons who were specialists in ruling. History shows that the state as a special apparatus for coercing people arose wherever and whenever there appeared a division of society into classes, that is, a division into groups of people some of which were permanently in a position to appropriate the labour of others, where some people exploited others.

And this division of society into classes must always be clearly borne in mind as a fundamental fact of history. The development of all human societies for thousands of years, in all countries without exception, reveals a general conformity to law, a regularity and consistency; so that at first we had a society without classes—the original patriarchal, primitive society, in which there were no aristocrats; then we had a society based on slavery—a slave-owning society. The whole of modern, civilised Europe has passed through this stage—slavery ruled supreme two thousand years ago. The vast majority of peoples of the other parts of the world also passed through this stage. Traces of slavery survive to this day among the less developed peoples; you will find the institution of slavery in Africa, for example, at the present time. The division into slave-owners and slaves was the first important class division. The former group not only owned all the means of production—the land and the implements, however poor and primitive they may have been in those times—but also owned people. This group was known as slave-owners,

while those who laboured and supplied labour for others were known as slaves.

This form was followed in history by another—feudalism. In the great majority of countries slavery in the course of its development evolved into serfdom. The fundamental division of society was now into feudal lords and peasant serfs. The form of relations between people changed. The slave-owners had regarded the slaves as their property; the law had confirmed this view and regarded the slave as a chattel completely owned by the slave-owner. As far as the peasant serf was concerned, class oppression and dependence remained, but it was not considered that the feudal lord owned the peasants as chattels, but that he was only entitled to their labour, to the obligatory performance of certain services. In practice, as you know, serfdom, especially in Russia where it survived longest of all and assumed the crudest forms, in no way differed from slavery.

Further, with the development of trade, the appearance of the world market and the development of money circulation, a new class arose within feudal society—the capitalist class. From the commodity, the exchange of commodities and the rise of the power of money, there derived the power of capital. During the eighteenth century, or rather, from the end of the eighteenth century and during the nineteenth century, revolutions took place all over the world. Feudalism was abolished in all the countries of Western Europe. Russia was the last country in which this took place. In 1861 a radical change took place in Russia as well; as a consequence of this one form of society was replaced by another—feudalism was replaced by capitalism, under which division into classes remained, as well as various traces and remnants of serfdom, but fundamentally the division into classes assumed a different form.

The owners of capital, the owners of the land and the owners of the factories in all capitalist countries constituted and still constitute an insignificant minority of the population who have complete command of the labour of the whole people, and, consequently, command, oppress and exploit the whole mass of labourers, the majority of whom are proletarians, wage-workers, who procure their livelihood in the process of production only by the sale of

their own worker's hands, their labour-power. With the transition to capitalism, the peasants, who had been disunited and downtrodden in feudal times, were converted partly (the majority) into proletarians, and partly (the minority) into wealthy peasants who themselves hired labourers and who constituted a rural bourgeoisie.

This fundamental fact—the transition of society from primitive forms of slavery to serfdom and finally to capitalism—you must always bear in mind, for only by remembering this fundamental fact, only by examining all political doctrines placed in this fundamental scheme, will you be able properly to appraise these doctrines and understand what they refer to; for each of these great periods in the history of mankind, slave-owning, feudal and capitalist, embraces scores and hundreds of centuries and presents such a mass of political forms, such a variety of political doctrines, opinions and revolutions, that this extreme diversity and immense variety (especially in connection with the political, philosophical and other doctrines of bourgeois scholars and politicians) can be understood only by firmly holding, as to a guiding thread, to this division of society into classes, this change in the forms of class rule, and from this standpoint examining all social questions—economic, political, spiritual, religious, etc.

If you examine the state from the standpoint of this fundamental division, you will find that before the division of society into classes, as I have already said, no state existed. But as the social division into classes arose and took firm root, as class society arose, the state also arose and took firm root. The history of mankind knows scores and hundreds of countries that have passed or are still passing through slavery, feudalism and capitalism. In each of these countries, despite the immense historical changes that have taken place, despite all the political vicissitudes and all the revolutions due to this development of mankind, to the transition from slavery through feudalism to capitalism and to the present world-wide struggle against capitalism, you will always discern the emergence of the state. It has always been a certain apparatus which stood outside society and consisted of a group of people engaged solely, or almost solely, or mainly, in ruling. People are divided into the

ruled, and into specialists in ruling, those who rise above society and are called rulers, statesmen. This apparatus, this group of people who rule others, always possesses certain means of coercion, of physical force, irrespective of whether this violence over people is expressed in the primitive club, or in more perfected types of weapons in the epoch of slavery, or in the fire-arms which appeared in the Middle Ages, or, finally, in modern weapons, which in the twentieth century are technical marvels and are based entirely on the latest achievements of modern technology. The methods of violence changed, but whenever there was a state there existed in every society a group of persons who ruled, who commanded, who dominated and who in order to maintain their power possessed an apparatus of physical coercion, an apparatus of violence, with those weapons which corresponded to the technical level of the given epoch. And by examining these general phenomena, by asking ourselves why no state existed when there were no classes, when there were no exploiters and exploited, and why it appeared when classes appeared—only in this way shall we find a definite answer to the question of what is the nature and significance of the state.

The state is a machine for maintaining the rule of one class over another. When there were no classes in society, when, before the epoch of slavery, people laboured in primitive conditions of greater equality, in conditions when the productivity of labour was still at its lowest, and when primitive man could barely procure the wherewithal for the crudest and most primitive existence, a special group of people whose function is to rule and to dominate the rest of society, had not and could not yet have emerged. Only when the first form of the division of society into classes appeared, only when slavery appeared, when a certain class of people, by concentrating on the crudest forms of agricultural labour, could produce a certain surplus, when this surplus was not absolutely essential for the most wretched existence of the slave and passed into the hands of the slave-owner, when in this way the existence of this class of slave-owners was secure—then in order that it might take firm root it was necessary for a state to appear.

And it did appear—the slave-owning state, an apparatus which gave the slave-owners power and enabled them to

rule over the slaves. Both society and the state were then on a much smaller scale than they are now, they possessed incomparably poorer means of communication—the modern means of communication did not then exist. Mountains, rivers and seas were immeasurably greater obstacles than they are now, and the state took shape within far narrower geographical boundaries. A technically weak state apparatus served a state confined within relatively narrow boundaries and with a narrow range of action. Nevertheless, there did exist an apparatus which compelled the slaves to remain in slavery, which kept one part of society subjugated to and oppressed by another. It is impossible to compel the greater part of society to work systematically for the other part of society without a permanent apparatus of coercion. So long as there were no classes, there was no apparatus of this sort. When classes appeared, everywhere and always, as the division grew and took firmer hold, there also appeared a special institution—the state. The forms of state were extremely varied. As early as the period of slavery we find diverse forms of the state in the countries that were the most advanced, cultured and civilised according to the standards of the time—for example, in ancient Greece and Rome—which were based entirely on slavery. At that time there was already a difference between monarchy and republic, between aristocracy and democracy. A monarchy is the power of a single person, a republic is the absence of any non-elected authority; an aristocracy is the power of a relatively small minority, a democracy is the power of the people (democracy in Greek literally means the power of the people). All these differences arose in the epoch of slavery. Despite these differences, the state of the slave-owning epoch was a slave-owning state, irrespective of whether it was a monarchy or a republic, aristocratic or democratic.

In every course on the history of ancient times, in any lecture on this subject, you will hear about the struggle which was waged between the monarchical and republican states. But the fundamental fact is that the slaves were not regarded as human beings—not only were they not regarded as citizens, they were not even regarded as human beings. Roman law regarded them as chattels. The law of manslaughter, not to mention the other laws for the protection of the

person, did not extend to slaves. It defended only the slave-owners, who were alone recognised as citizens with full rights. But whether a monarchy was instituted or a republic, it was a monarchy of the slave-owners or a republic of the slave-owners. All rights were enjoyed by the slave-owners, while the slave was a chattel in the eyes of the law; and not only could any sort of violence be perpetrated against a slave, but even the killing of a slave was not considered a crime. Slave-owning republics differed in their internal organisation, there were aristocratic republics and democratic republics. In an aristocratic republic only a small number of privileged persons took part in the elections; in a democratic republic everybody took part—but everybody meant only the slave-owners, that is, everybody except the slaves. This fundamental fact must be borne in mind, because it throws more light than any other on the question of the state and clearly demonstrates the nature of the state.

The state is a machine for the oppression of one class by another, a machine for holding in obedience to one class other, subordinated classes. There are various forms of this machine. The slave-owning state could be a monarchy, an aristocratic republic or even a democratic republic. In fact the forms of government varied extremely, but their essence was always the same: the slaves enjoyed no rights and constituted an oppressed class; they were not regarded as human beings. We find the same thing in the feudal state.

The change in the form of exploitation transformed the slave-owning state into the feudal state. This was of immense importance. In slave-owning society the slave enjoyed no rights whatever and was not regarded as a human being; in feudal society the peasant was bound to the soil. The chief distinguishing feature of serfdom was that the peasants (and at that time the peasants constituted the majority; the urban population was still very small) were considered bound to the land—this is the very basis of "serfdom". The peasant might work a definite number of days for himself on the plot assigned to him by the landlord; on the other days the peasant serf worked for his lord. The essence of class society remained—society was based on class exploitation. Only the owners of the land could enjoy full rights; the peasants had no rights at all. In practice their condition differed

very little from the condition of slaves in the slave-owning state. Nevertheless, a wider road was opened for their emancipation, for the emancipation of the peasants, since the peasant serf was not regarded as the direct property of the lord. He could work part of his time on his own plot, could, so to speak, belong to himself to some extent; and with the wider opportunities for the development of exchange and trade relations the feudal system steadily disintegrated and the scope of emancipation of the peasantry steadily widened. Feudal society was always more complex than slave society. There was a greater development of trade and industry, which even in those days led to capitalism. In the Middle Ages feudalism predominated. And here too the forms of state varied, here too we find both the monarchy and the republic, although the latter was much more weakly expressed. But always the feudal lord was regarded as the only ruler. The peasant serfs were deprived of absolutely all political rights.

Neither under slavery nor under the feudal system could a small minority of people dominate over the vast majority without coercion. History is full of the constant attempts of the oppressed classes to throw off oppression. The history of slavery contains records of wars of emancipation from slavery which lasted for decades. Incidentally, the name "Spartacist" now adopted by the German Communists—the only German party which is really fighting against the yoke of capitalism—was adopted by them because Spartacus was one of the most prominent heroes of one of the greatest revolts of slaves, which took place about two thousand years ago. For many years the seemingly omnipotent Roman Empire, which rested entirely on slavery, experienced the shocks and blows of a widespread uprising of slaves who armed and united to form a vast army under the leadership of Spartacus. In the end they were defeated, captured and put to torture by the slave-owners. Such civil wars mark the whole history of the existence of class society. I have just mentioned an example of the greatest of these civil wars in the epoch of slavery. The whole epoch of feudalism is likewise marked by constant uprisings of the peasants. For example, in Germany in the Middle Ages the struggle between the two classes—the landlords and the

serfs—assumed wide proportions and was transformed into a civil war of the peasants against the landowners. You are all familiar with similar examples of repeated uprisings of the peasants against the feudal landowners in Russia.

In order to maintain their rule and to preserve their power, the feudal lords had to have an apparatus by which they could unite under their subjugation a vast number of people and subordinate them to certain laws and regulations; and all these laws fundamentally amounted to one thing—the maintenance of the power of the lords over the peasant serfs. And this was the feudal state, which in Russia, for example, or in quite backward Asiatic countries (where feudalism prevails to this day) differed in form—it was either a republic or a monarchy. When the state was a monarchy, the rule of one person was recognised; when it was a republic, the participation of the elected representatives of landowning society was in one degree or another recognised—this was in feudal society. Feudal society represented a division of classes under which the vast majority—the peasant serfs—were completely subjected to an insignificant minority—the owners of the land.

The development of trade, the development of commodity exchange, led to the emergence of a new class—the capitalists. Capital took shape as such at the close of the Middle Ages, when, after the discovery of America, world trade developed enormously, when the quantity of precious metals increased, when silver and gold became the medium of exchange, when money circulation made it possible for individuals to possess tremendous wealth. Silver and gold were recognised as wealth all over the world. The economic power of the landowning class declined and the power of the new class—the representatives of capital—developed. The reconstruction of society was such that all citizens seemed to be equal, the old division into slave-owners and slaves disappeared, all were regarded as equal before the law irrespective of what capital each owned; whether he owned land as private property, or was a poor man who owned nothing but his labour-power—all were equal before the law. The law protects everybody equally; it protects the property of those who have it from attack by the masses who, possessing no property, possessing nothing but their labour-

power, grow steadily impoverished and ruined and become converted into proletarians. Such is capitalist society.

I cannot dwell on it in detail. You will return to this when you come to discuss the Programme of the Party—you will then hear a description of capitalist society. This society advanced against serfdom, against the old feudal system, under the slogan of liberty. But it was liberty for those who owned property. And when feudalism was shattered, which occurred at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century—in Russia it occurred later than in other countries, in 1861—the feudal state was then superseded by the capitalist state, which proclaims liberty for the whole people as its slogan, which declares that it expresses the will of the whole people and denies that it is a class state. And here there developed a struggle between the socialists, who are fighting for the liberty of the whole people, and the capitalist state—a struggle which has led to the creation of the Soviet Socialist Republic and which is going on throughout the world.

To understand the struggle that has been started against world capital, to understand the nature of the capitalist state, we must remember that when the capitalist state advanced against the feudal state it entered the fight under the slogan of liberty. The abolition of feudalism meant liberty for the representatives of the capitalist state and served their purpose, inasmuch as serfdom was breaking down and the peasants had acquired the opportunity of owning as their full property the land which they had purchased for compensation or in part by quit-rent—this did not concern the state: it protected property irrespective of its origin, because the state was founded on private property. The peasants became private owners in all the modern, civilised states. Even when the landowner surrendered part of his land to the peasant, the state protected private property, rewarding the landowner by compensation, by letting him take money for the land. The state as it were declared that it would fully preserve private property, and it accorded it every support and protection. The state recognised the property rights of every merchant, industrialist and manufacturer. And this society, based on private property, on the power of capital, on the complete subjection of the

propertyless workers and labouring masses of the peasantry, proclaimed that its rule was based on liberty. Combating feudalism, it proclaimed freedom of property and was particularly proud of the fact that the state had ceased, supposedly, to be a class state.

Yet the state continued to be a machine which helped the capitalists to hold the poor peasants and the working class in subjection. But in outward appearance it was free. It proclaimed universal suffrage, and declared through its champions, preachers, scholars and philosophers, that it was not a class state. Even now, when the Soviet Socialist Republics have begun to fight the state, they accuse us of violating liberty, of building a state based on coercion, on the suppression of some by others, whereas they represent a popular, democratic state. And now, when the world socialist revolution has begun, and when the revolution has succeeded in some countries, when the fight against world capital has grown particularly acute, this question of the state has acquired the greatest importance and has become, one might say, the most burning one, the focus of all present-day political questions and political disputes.

Whichever party we take in Russia or in any of the more civilised countries, we find that nearly all political disputes, disagreements and opinions now centre around the conception of the state. Is the state in a capitalist country, in a democratic republic—especially one like Switzerland or the U.S.A.—in the freest democratic republics, an expression of the popular will, the sum total of the general decision of the people, the expression of the national will, and so forth; or is the state a machine that enables the capitalists of those countries to maintain their power over the working class and the peasantry? That is the fundamental question around which all political disputes all over the world now centre. What do they say about Bolshevism? The bourgeois press abuses the Bolsheviks. You will not find a single newspaper that does not repeat the hackneyed accusation that the Bolsheviks violate popular rule. If our Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries in their simplicity of heart (perhaps it is not simplicity, or perhaps it is the simplicity which the proverb says is worse than robbery) think that they discovered and invented the accusation that

the Bolsheviks have violated liberty and popular rule, they are ludicrously mistaken. Today every one of the richest newspapers in the richest countries, which spend tens of millions on their distribution and disseminate bourgeois lies and imperialist policy in tens of millions of copies—every one of these newspapers repeats these basic arguments and accusations against Bolshevism, namely, that the U.S.A., Britain and Switzerland are advanced states based on popular rule, whereas the Bolshevik republic is a state of bandits in which liberty is unknown, and that the Bolsheviks have violated the idea of popular rule and have even gone so far as to disperse the Constituent Assembly. These terrible accusations against the Bolsheviks are repeated all over the world. These accusations lead us directly to the question—what is the state? In order to understand these accusations, in order to study them and have a fully intelligent attitude towards them, and not to examine them on hearsay but with a firm opinion of our own, we must have a clear idea of what the state is. We have before us capitalist states of every kind and all the theories in defence of them which were created before the war. In order to answer the question properly we must critically examine all these theories and views.

I have already advised you to turn for help to Engels's book *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*. This book says that every state in which private ownership of the land and means of production exists, in which capital dominates, however democratic it may be, is a capitalist state, a machine used by the capitalists to keep the working class and the poor peasants in subjection; while universal suffrage, a Constituent Assembly, a parliament are merely a form, a sort of promissory note, which does not change the real state of affairs.

The forms of domination of the state may vary: capital manifests its power in one way where one form exists, and in another way where another form exists—but essentially the power is in the hands of capital, whether there are voting qualifications or some other rights or not, or whether the republic is a democratic one or not—in fact, the more democratic it is the cruder and more cynical is the rule of capitalism. One of the most democratic republics in the

world is the United States of America, yet nowhere (and those who have been there since 1905 probably know it) is the power of capital, the power of a handful of multimillionaires over the whole of society, so crude and so openly corrupt as in America. Once capital exists, it dominates the whole of society, and no democratic republic, no franchise can change its nature.

The democratic republic and universal suffrage were an immense progressive advance as compared with feudalism: they have enabled the proletariat to achieve its present unity and solidarity, to form those firm and disciplined ranks which are waging a systematic struggle against capital. There was nothing even approximately resembling this among the peasant serfs, not to speak of the slaves. The slaves, as we know, revolted, rioted, started civil wars, but they could never create a class-conscious majority and parties to lead the struggle, they could not clearly realise what their aims were, and even in the most revolutionary moments of history they were always pawns in the hands of the ruling classes. The bourgeois republic, parliament, universal suffrage—all represent great progress from the standpoint of the world development of society. Mankind moved towards capitalism, and it was capitalism alone which, thanks to urban culture, enabled the oppressed proletarian class to become conscious of itself and to create the world working-class movement, the millions of workers organised all over the world in parties—the socialist parties which are consciously leading the struggle of the masses. Without parliamentarism, without an electoral system, this development of the working class would have been impossible. That is why all these things have acquired such great importance in the eyes of the broad masses of people. That is why a radical change seems to be so difficult. It is not only the conscious hypocrites, scientists and priests that uphold and defend the bourgeois lie that the state is free and that it is its mission to defend the interests of all; so also do a large number of people who sincerely adhere to the old prejudices and who cannot understand the transition from the old, capitalist society to socialism. Not only people who are directly dependent on the bourgeoisie, not only those who live under the yoke of capital or who have been

bribed by capital (there are a large number of all sorts of scientists, artists, priests, etc., in the service of capital), but even people who are simply under the sway of the prejudice of bourgeois liberty, have taken up arms against Bolshevism all over the world because when the Soviet Republic was founded it rejected these bourgeois lies and openly declared: you say your state is free, whereas in reality, as long as there is private property, your state, even if it is a democratic republic, is nothing but a machine used by the capitalists to suppress the workers, and the freer the state, the more clearly is this expressed. Examples of this are Switzerland in Europe and the United States in America. Nowhere does capital rule so cynically and ruthlessly, and nowhere is it so clearly apparent, as in these countries, although they are democratic republics, no matter how prettily they are painted and notwithstanding all the talk about labour democracy and the equality of all citizens. The fact is that in Switzerland and the United States capital dominates, and every attempt of the workers to achieve the slightest real improvement in their condition is immediately met by civil war. There are fewer soldiers, a smaller standing army, in these countries—Switzerland has a militia and every Swiss has a gun at home, while in America there was no standing army until quite recently—and so when there is a strike the bourgeoisie arms, hires soldiery and suppresses the strike; and nowhere is this suppression of the working-class movement accompanied by such ruthless severity as in Switzerland and the U.S.A., and nowhere does the influence of capital in parliament manifest itself as powerfully as in these countries. The power of capital is everything, the stock exchange is everything, while parliament and elections are marionettes, puppets.... But the eyes of the workers are being opened more and more, and the idea of Soviet government is spreading farther and farther afield, especially after the bloody carnage we have just experienced. The necessity for a relentless war on the capitalists is becoming clearer and clearer to the working class.

Whatever guise a republic may assume, however democratic it may be, if it is a bourgeois republic, if it retains private ownership of the land and factories, and if private capital keeps the whole of society in wage-slavery, that is,

if the republic does not carry out what is proclaimed in the Programme of our Party and in the Soviet Constitution, then this state is a machine for the suppression of some people by others. And we shall place this machine in the hands of the class that is to overthrow the power of capital. We shall reject all the old prejudices about the state meaning universal equality—for that is a fraud: as long as there is exploitation there cannot be equality. The landowner cannot be the equal of the worker, or the hungry man the equal of the full man. This machine called the state, before which people bowed in superstitious awe, believing the old tales that it means popular rule, tales which the proletariat declares to be a bourgeois lie—this machine the proletariat will smash. So far we have deprived the capitalists of this machine and have taken it over. We shall use this machine, or bludgeon, to destroy all exploitation. And when the possibility of exploitation no longer exists anywhere in the world, when there are no longer owners of land and owners of factories, and when there is no longer a situation in which some gorge while others starve, only when the possibility of this no longer exists shall we consign this machine to the scrap-heap. Then there will be no state and no exploitation. Such is the view of our Communist Party. I hope that we shall return to this subject in subsequent lectures, return to it again and again.

Published according to
the verbatim report

THE DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN SITUATION OF THE REPUBLIC

REPORT DELIVERED TO THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE
OF THE R.C.P. (B.)
JULY 12, 1919 ⁷⁴

NEWSPAPER REPORT

The previous speaker spoke of the feelings of deep regret with which we have had to contravene our food policy.⁷⁵ None of this, of course, is anything more than darning the holes of an old garment instead of acquiring a new one. But what we have done is right. We may recall last year, when the food situation was much worse—we had absolutely no food resources. At that time there was considerable confusion in our ranks because we had to retract from the principles of our food policy. It was thought that small concessions would lead to bigger ones and that a return to a socialist policy would be impossible. That turned out to be untrue. Difficult as the situation was, we got over it, and our enemies' hopes were not fulfilled.

The situation today is much better than last year's; we now have food resources we dared not even dream of last year. The territory occupied by the enemy was much greater last year. We have now scored big victories in the East where a bumper harvest is expected. Apart from that we have experience, and that is the main thing. Having this experience we are able to say with greater confidence that we shall overcome the difficulties that stand in our way. July is the worst month not only as far as food is concerned, but also because counter-revolution raises its head higher than before.

The counter-revolutionary wave inside the country, however, was more powerful last year than this. The activities of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries had reached the highest point at that time. The armed struggle that they launched suddenly in place of their verbal support took us by surprise. The difficulties were immense, for they had chosen their time very cleverly. The Socialist-Revolutionaries hoped to play on the mood of the man in the street who was in despair from hunger. At the same time Muravyov betrayed us at the front. The revolt of the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries was very quickly suppressed but there was serious wavering in the provinces for several days.

We now have a more correct attitude to the petty-bourgeois parties, due to the year's experience. The experience of the revolts led by Makhno and Grigoriev and the waverings of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks have shown us that their influence over the worker and peasant masses is only an apparent one. Their actual strength is nil, so that when we are told that Chernov at a recent meeting of the Council of the Right Socialist-Revolutionary Party said, "If not we and not today, then who else will kick out the Bolsheviks?" we can only say, "The nightmare was terrible, but God is good." Today we can only express our amazement at their not being tired of repeating their own mistakes. Throughout two years we have been witnessing the complete collapse of all their dreams about "democracy in general", nevertheless every one of their groups considers it its duty to make the experiment in its own way. The development of the revolution shows that their mistakes are being repeated and that the repetition is causing us countless calamities. The peasants in the East supported the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the Mensheviks because they did not want war and realised that the Bolsheviks were a sound government that would insist on their participating in the war. The result was that Kolchak forces appeared and brought countless calamities. Now that they are retreating they are destroying everything in their path, the country is completely ruined and the sufferings there are unimaginable, far worse than anything we are experiencing. To speak of Bolshevik atrocities in face of these facts requires all the hypocrisy of bourgeois writers.

In the Kolchak business, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks have again followed the same sanguinary political road as they did with Kerensky; it has brought them back to the starting-point and has demonstrated the falseness of all their coalition ideas.

The masses have now abandoned them and we are witnessing a revolt in Siberia in which not only workers and peasants but even intellectuals and kulaks are taking part. We see the complete collapse of Kolchak's movement. Apparently every one of their mistakes must be repeated before the eyes of the unenlightened masses are opened. When the masses see that the coalition leads to reaction they come to us, battered and tormented but nevertheless taught and steeled by experience. The same may be said of all imperialists. They drag out the war, cause greater exhaustion and thereby merely strengthen in the masses a consciousness of the need for revolution. Difficult as the year has been, it has been useful because not only the leaders but even the broadest masses, even the peasants in the most remote holes and corners have had an experience that has led them to draw the same conclusions as we do. This gives us firm conviction in our victory. Without Kolchak the Siberian peasants would not have become convinced in a single year that they need our workers' government. It took the very sad experience of this year to convince them of that.

It is quite possible that the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik literary groups will die out without ever having understood anything about our revolution and for a long time will continue repeating, parrot fashion, that theirs would have been the best government in the world, a truly socialist and truly democratic government without civil war, if it had not been for Kolchak and the Bolsheviks; that, however, is not important, there have also been stubborn cranks in all revolutions. The important thing is that the masses who followed them are now leaving them. The peasant masses have gone over to the Bolsheviks—that is a fact. Siberia demonstrates this best of all. The peasants will not forget what they experienced under Kolchak's government; the greater the trials, the better the Bolsheviks' lessons will have been learned.

We are now gaining important victories on the Eastern Front and these give us reason to hope that we shall have finished with Kolchak in the East in a few weeks. A turning-point has been reached on the Southern Front, and, what is more important, a turning-point in the temper of the peasants in the vicinity of the front has also been reached. These, incidentally, are rich peasants—middle peasants in those parts are like kulaks. But there has been a change in their mood in our favour—this is a fact that is proved by the return of deserters and by the armed resistance we are putting up. The workers living in the towns, where they are close to events, assimilate our ideas from conferences, speeches and newspapers. The peasant cannot do this, he is convinced only from his own experience. The peasants in the South were prepared to curse the Bolsheviks in words, but when Denikin arrived shouting about democracy (for it is not only the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries that shout about it, the word is to be found in every line of Denikin's newspaper) the peasants began to fight against him for they soon realised from their own experience that floggings and plunder lay hidden under the pretty words. The torments and ruination in the districts near the Southern Front are having the same effect as in the East—they are giving us more reliable gains. We have not for a moment forgotten the difficulties that we are experiencing, we have not forgotten that the greatest effort and the mobilisation of our forces are essential, but we can say that the result will be a more sound victory. The experience of the past year has shown the masses that today only one form of power is possible and necessary—the workers' and peasants' power of the Bolsheviks. That is what enables us to say with confidence that this difficult July will be the last difficult July.

A glance at the international situation only serves to strengthen our confidence in victory.

Forces friendly to us are growing up in all hostile states. Take the small countries—Finland, Latvia, Poland, Rumania. All attempts to set up a coalition of the big and petty bourgeoisie in those countries to fight against us have ended in a break-down and ours turns out to be the only form of government possible there.

The same thing is true of big states. Take Germany. Immediately the Treaty of Versailles was signed a big revolutionary movement began. The Entente bogey has gone and the workers are now rising, notwithstanding all the sacrifices that the proletariat has made. During the past year Germany has had the same experience as we and Siberia have had, but in a somewhat different form—experience that will lead to the communist revolution. And what about the Entente, the victors? They say that victory has given them security, but no sooner had they signed the peace treaty than it became clear that in signing it they were signing their own death warrant. The mass movement against them is growing. That is why we say with confidence, taking all our experience, all that has happened in the past year into account, that we shall surmount all difficulties and that this July will be the last difficult July, and that next July we shall welcome the victory of the world Soviet republic and that victory will be full and complete.

Pravda No. 154,
July 16, 1919

Published according to
the *Pravda* text

THE TASKS OF THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

RAMSAY MACDONALD ON THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

The French social-chauvinist newspaper *l'Humanité*,⁷⁶ issue No. 5475, dated April 14, 1919, contains an editorial by Ramsay MacDonald, the well-known leader of the British so-called Independent Labour Party, which is actually an opportunist party that has always been dependent on the bourgeoisie. This article is so typical of the position taken by the *trend* which it is customary to call the Centre and which was called by that name at the First Congress of the Communist International in Moscow that we quote it *in full* together with the introductory lines of the *l'Humanité* editorial board:

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

Our friend Ramsay MacDonald was the authoritative leader of the Labour Party in the House of Commons before the war. A socialist and a man of convictions, he considered it his duty to condemn the war as imperialist, in contrast to those who welcomed it as a war for a righteous cause. Consequently, after August 4 he resigned from his position of leader of the Labour Party, and together with comrades in the Independent Labour Party and with Keir Hardie whom we all admire, did not fear to declare war on war.

This required day-to-day heroism.

MacDonald showed by his example that courage, in the words of Jaurès, "consists in not submitting to the law of the triumphant lie and in not serving as the echo of the applause of imbeciles and the catcalling of fanatics".

In the khaki* election held at the end of November, MacDonald was defeated by Lloyd George. But we may rest assured that MacDonald will have his revenge, and that in the very near future.

* Called "khaki" election by soldiers who were ordered to vote for the Government candidates.

The rise of separatist tendencies in the national and international policies of socialism has been a misfortune for the socialist movement.

It is, however, not a bad thing that there are shades of opinion and variations of method within socialism. Our socialism is still in the experimental stage.

Its basic principles are fixed, but the method of best applying them, the combinations which will bring about the triumph of the revolution, the manner in which the socialist state is to be built are still problems to be discussed, and the last word concerning them has not yet been spoken. Only deep study of all these points can lead us to sublimer truth.

Extremes may clash, and such a struggle may serve to fortify socialist views; but evil commences when everybody considers his opponent a traitor, a believer fallen from grace, one who deserves to have the gates of the party paradise slammed in his face.

When socialists are possessed by the spirit of dogmatism, like that which in former days of Christianity preached civil war for the greater glory of God and the discomfiture of the devil, the bourgeoisie may sleep in peace, for the days of its rule are not yet ended, no matter how great the local and international successes achieved by socialism.

At the present moment our movement is unfortunately encountering a new obstacle. A new International has been proclaimed in Moscow.

I am very much grieved over this, for the Socialist International is at present sufficiently open to all forms of socialist thought, and in spite of all theoretical and practical disagreements engendered within it by Bolshevism I see no reason why its Left wing should separate from the Centre and form an independent group.

It must first of all be remembered that we are still living in the infancy of the revolution. The forms of government that have sprung up from the political and social debris wrought by the war have not yet stood the test and have not yet been definitely established.

A new broom sweeps remarkably clean at first, but nobody can be certain beforehand how it will work in the end.

Russia is not Hungary, Hungary is not France, France is not Britain, and therefore anyone who introduces a split in the International after the experience of some one nation displays criminal narrow-mindedness.

Besides, what is Russia's experience really worth? Who can answer that? The Allied governments are afraid to let us enlighten ourselves. But there are two things we do know.

First and foremost, that there was no prepared plan according to which the revolution was accomplished by the present Russian Government. It developed according to the course of events. Lenin started his attack on Kerensky by demanding a Constituent Assembly. Events led him to suppress this Assembly. When the socialist revolution broke out in Russia no one thought the Soviets would take the place in the government which they did.

Subsequently Lenin quite justly exhorted Hungary not to copy Russia slavishly but to allow the Hungarian revolution to evolve freely according to its own character.

The evolution and fluctuations of those experiments we are now witnessing should on no account call forth a split in the International.

All socialist governments need the help and advice of the International. It is necessary that the International should watch their experiences with an alert eye and an open mind.

I have just heard from a friend who recently saw Lenin that no one is more free in his criticism of the Soviet Government than Lenin himself.

If the post-war disorders and revolutions do not justify a split, does the latter not find justification in the attitude which some socialist factions took during the war? I frankly admit that here the grounds may seem more justified. But if there really is some excuse for split in the International, this question was at any rate presented most unhappily at the Moscow Conference.

I am one of those who consider that the discussion at the Berne Conference on who was responsible for the war *was merely a concession to non-socialist public opinion.*

At Berne it was not only impossible to adopt a decision on this question that would be of some historical value (although it might have some political value), but even the question itself was not broached properly.

The condemnation of the German majority (a condemnation which that majority fully deserved and with which I have very gladly associated myself) could not serve as an exposition of the origin of the war.

The Berne debate was not accompanied by a frank discussion of the views held by other socialists concerning the war.

It produced no formula of conduct for socialists during a war. All the International had said before then was that in a war of national defence socialists must unite with the other parties.

Under these circumstances whom are we going to condemn?

Some of us knew that what the International decided meant nothing and did not constitute a practical guide for action.

We knew that such a war would end in victory for imperialism and, being neither pacifists in the usual sense of the word nor anti-pacifists, we pursued a policy which in our opinion was the only one compatible with internationalism. *But the International never prescribed any such rule of conduct for us.*

That is why the moment the war began the International collapsed. It lost its authority and did not issue a single decision on the basis of which we would now have the right to condemn those who honestly carried out the resolutions of the international congresses.

In consequence, the attitude we should adopt today is the following: instead of parting ways on account of what has taken place, let us create a really active International which will guard the socialist

movement during the period of revolution and reconstruction which we have now entered.

We must restore our socialist principles. We must place our international socialist conduct on firm foundations.

If, however, it appears that we differ essentially on these principles, if we do not arrive at any agreement on the issues of freedom and democracy, if our views on the conditions under which the proletariat may take power are definitely at variance, if finally it turns out that the war has infected some sections of the International with the virus of imperialism, then a split is possible.

But I do not think there should be such a calamity.

That is why I regret the Moscow Manifesto as being premature, to say the least, and certainly useless; and I hope that my French comrades, upon whom as well as upon me during the sombre last four years so much slander and misfortune has been heaped, will not, in an outburst of impatience, be instrumental in breaking up international solidarity.

Otherwise their children will have to set up that solidarity once more, if the proletariat is ever to rule the world.

J. Ramsay MacDonald

The author of this article, as the reader can see, tries to prove that a split is unnecessary. However, its inevitability follows from the very way the argument is presented by Ramsay MacDonald—that typical representative of the Second International and worthy colleague of Scheidemann and Kautsky, Vandervelde and Branting, and so on and so forth.

Ramsay MacDonald's article is a fine specimen of the smooth, euphonious, hackneyed, apparently socialistic phrases which have long served in all the advanced capitalist countries to conceal bourgeois policy within the working-class movement.

I

Let us begin with what is least important but especially characteristic. Like Kautsky (in his pamphlet *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*), the author repeats the bourgeois lie that no one in Russia foresaw the role of the Soviets, that the Bolsheviks and I began to fight Kerensky only on the issue of the Constituent Assembly.

That is a bourgeois lie. Actually, as early as April 4, 1917, the first day after my arrival in Petrograd, I presented

"theses" containing the demand for a *Soviet*, and not a *bourgeois-parliamentary*, republic. I repeated this many times under Kerensky in the press and at meetings. The Bolshevik Party solemnly and officially announced this in the decisions of its conference of April 29, 1917. Who does not know this does *not want* to know the truth about the socialist revolution in Russia. If one does not want to understand that a bourgeois-parliamentary republic with a Constituent Assembly is a step forward from the same sort of republic *without* a Constituent Assembly, and that a *Soviet* republic is two steps forward, one is merely closing one's eyes to the difference between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

To call oneself a socialist and not to see this difference two years after the issue was raised in Russia and one and a half years after the victory of the Soviet revolution in Russia means stubbornly to remain completely captive to "non-socialist public opinion", *that is to say*, to the ideas and the policy of the bourgeoisie.

A split with such people is necessary and inevitable, for it is impossible to accomplish the socialist revolution if you join hands with those who pull in the direction of the bourgeoisie.

And if "leaders" like Ramsay MacDonald or Kautsky, etc., have refused to overcome even so very small a "difficulty" as an acquaintance with the *documents* concerning the attitude of the Bolsheviks toward Soviet power, concerning the way this problem was posed before and after October 25 (November 7), 1917, would it not be ridiculous to expect such people to be ready and able to overcome the incomparably greater difficulties of the real struggle for a socialist revolution?

There are none so deaf as those who will not hear.

II

Let us pass on to the second untruth (from among the countless untruths in which the whole article by Ramsay MacDonald abounds, for in this article there are perhaps more untruths than words). This untruth is probably the most important one.

Ramsay MacDonald asserts that until the war of 1914-18 the International only said that "in a war of national defence socialists must unite with the other parties".

That is a monstrous, a glaring deviation from the truth.

Everybody knows that the Basle Manifesto of 1912 was unanimously adopted by all socialists and that of all the documents of the International it alone refers precisely to the war between the British and German groups of imperialist predators, which in 1912 everybody clearly saw was in preparation and which broke out in 1914. It was about this war that the Basle Manifesto said three things which MacDonald now passes over in silence, thereby committing an enormous crime against socialism and proving that with people like him a split is necessary, because in fact they serve the bourgeoisie and not the proletariat.

These three things are the following:

the war that threatens cannot be justified one whit as being in the interest of national freedom;

in this war it would be a crime on the part of the workers to shoot at one another;

the war leads to proletarian revolution.

Here you have the three basic, fundamental truths, by "forgetting" which (though he put his signature to them before the war) MacDonald *in fact* is going over to the bourgeoisie against the proletariat and thereby proves that a split is necessary.

The Communist International will not agree to unity with parties which refuse to admit this truth and are incapable of demonstrating by their *deeds* their determination, readiness and ability to bring these truths home to the masses.

The Treaty of Versailles has proved even to the stupid and blind, even to the mass of short-sighted people, that the Entente was and is as bloody and filthy an imperialist predator as Germany. Only hypocrites and liars could fail to see this, people who deliberately conduct the policy of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement, direct agents and henchmen of the bourgeoisie (labour lieutenants of the capitalist class,* as the American Socialists say), or people

* These words are in English in the original.—Ed.

who have so far succumbed to bourgeois ideas and bourgeois influence that they are socialists only in words, but in deeds are petty bourgeois, philistines, toadies to the capitalists. The difference between the first and the second category is important from the viewpoint of their personalities, i.e., for an appraisal of the Tom, Dick or Harry of the social-chauvinists of all countries. For the politician, i.e., from the viewpoint of the relations among millions of people, among the classes, this difference is not substantial.

Those socialists who during the war of 1914-18 failed to understand that it was a criminal, reactionary, predatory, imperialist war on both sides, are social-chauvinists, i.e., socialists in words and chauvinists in deeds; friends of the working class in words, but in deeds lackeys of "their own" national bourgeoisie, individuals who help to deceive the people by depicting as "national", "emancipatory", "defensive", "righteous" and so forth the war between the British and German groups of imperialist predators, who are *equally* filthy, selfish, blood-thirsty, criminal, reactionary.

Unity with the social-chauvinists is betrayal of the revolution, betrayal of the proletariat, betrayal of socialism, desertion to the bourgeoisie, because it is "unity" with the *national bourgeoisie* of "one's own" country *against* the unity of the international revolutionary proletariat, is unity *with* the bourgeoisie *against* the proletariat.

The war of 1914-18 has definitely proved this. Let anyone who does not understand this remain in the yellow Berne International of traitor-socialists.

III

Ramsay MacDonald, with the amusing naïveté of a "drawing-room" socialist who carelessly uses words without at all understanding their serious significance, giving no thought whatever to the fact that *words commit one to deeds*, declares that in Berne "a concession to non-socialist public opinion" was made.

Precisely! We regard the whole of the Berne International as yellow, treacherous and perfidious because the *whole* of its policy is a "concession" to the bourgeoisie.

Ramsay MacDonald knows perfectly well that we have built the Third International and broken unreservedly with the Second International because we became convinced that it was hopeless, incorrigible, played the part of a servant to imperialism, of a vehicle of bourgeois influence, bourgeois lies and bourgeois corruption in the labour movement. If in desiring to discuss the Third International Ramsay MacDonald evades the substance of the matter, beats about the bush, utters empty phrases and does not speak of what should be spoken about, that is his fault and his crime. For the proletariat needs the truth, and there is nothing more harmful to its cause than plausible, respectable, petty-bourgeois lies.

The problem of imperialism and of *its connection* with opportunism in the labour movement, with the betrayal of the workers' cause by labour leaders, was raised long ago, very long ago.

For a period of *forty* years, from 1852 to 1892, Marx and Engels constantly pointed to the fact that the upper stratum of the British working class was becoming increasingly *bourgeois* as a consequence of the country's peculiar economic conditions (colonies, monopoly of the world market, etc.).⁷⁷ In the seventies of last century Marx won himself the honourable hatred of the despicable heroes of the Berne International trend of those days, of the opportunists and reformists, for branding many of the British trade union leaders as men who had sold themselves to the bourgeoisie or were in its pay for services rendered to *its* class *from within* the labour movement.

During the Anglo-Boer War, the Anglo-Saxon press quite clearly raised the problem of imperialism as the latest (*and last*) stage of capitalism. If my memory serves me right, it was none other than Ramsay MacDonald who then resigned from the Fabian Society, that prototype of the Berne International, that nursery and model of opportunism, which Engels describes, with the power, brilliancy and truth of genius, in his correspondence with Sorge.⁷⁸ "Fabian imperialism"—such was the common expression employed at that time in British socialist literature.

If Ramsay MacDonald has forgotten this, all the worse for him.

"Fabian imperialism" and "social-imperialism" are one and the same thing: socialism in words, imperialism in deeds, *the growth of opportunism into imperialism*. This has now become, during the war of 1914-18 and since, a *universal* fact. The failure to understand it shows the great blindness of the Berne yellow International, and is its great crime. Opportunism, or reformism, inevitably had to grow into a phenomenon of world-wide importance, *socialist imperialism*, or social-chauvinism, because imperialism brought to the fore a handful of very rich, advanced nations, engaged in plundering the whole world, and thereby enabled the bourgeoisie of those countries, out of their monopolist superprofits (imperialism is monopoly capitalism), *to bribe the upper strata of the working class*.

Only ignoramuses or hypocrites who deceive the workers by repeating *platitudes* about capitalism and in this way cover up the bitter truth that *a whole trend in socialism* has gone over to the imperialist bourgeoisie could fail to see the economic inevitability of this development under imperialism.

And from this fact two indisputable conclusions emerge.

First conclusion: the Berne International is in fact, from the angle of its real historical and political role, and irrespective of the good will and pious wishes of particular members of it, *an organisation of agents of international imperialism* operating *within* the labour movement, permeating *that movement* with bourgeois influence, bourgeois ideas, bourgeois lies, and bourgeois corruption.

In countries where democratic parliamentary culture is of long standing, the bourgeoisie has learned splendidly to use deception, bribery and flattery in their most subtle forms as well as violence. Not for nothing have the "luncheons" given to British "labour leaders" (i.e., lieutenants of the bourgeoisie whose duty is to fool the workers) have acquired notoriety; Engels in his day spoke about them.⁷⁹ To the same category of facts belongs the "charming" reception given by M. Clemenceau to the traitor-socialist Merrheim, the courteous receptions given by Entente ministers to the leaders of the Berne International, and so on and so forth. "You train 'em, and we buy 'em," a clever capitalist, an Englishwoman, said to Mr. Social-imperial-

ist Hyndman, who related in his memoirs how this lady, a person shrewder than all the leaders of the Berne International put together, appraised the "labours" of the socialist intellectuals in training workers to become socialist leaders.

During the war, when the Vanderveldes, Brantings and the whole gang of traitors organised "international" conferences, the French bourgeois newspapers were bitingly scornful, and rightly so. They said: "These Vanderveldes seem to be suffering from a sort of tic. Just as those who suffer from tic cannot utter a couple of phrases without strangely twitching the muscles of the face, so the Vanderveldes cannot make a political speech without repeating, parrot-like, the words internationalism, socialism, international working-class solidarity, proletarian revolution, etc. Let them repeat any sacramental formulas they like so long as they help to lead the workers by the nose and serve us, the capitalists, in waging the imperialist war and enslaving the workers."

Sometimes the British and French bourgeoisie are very clever and excellently appraise the servile role played by the Berne International.

Martov wrote somewhere: "You Bolsheviks hurl abuse at the Berne International but 'your own' friend Loriot is a member of it."

That is the argument of a rogue; for everybody knows that Loriot is openly, honestly and heroically fighting for the Third International. In 1902, when Zubatov organised meetings of workers in Moscow in order to hoodwink them with "police socialism", the worker Babushkin, whom I had known since 1894 when he was in my study circle for workers in St. Petersburg, and who was one of the best and most devoted workers of the *Iskra* trend, one of the best leaders of the revolutionary proletariat, and was shot in 1906 by Rennenkampf in Siberia—Babushkin *used to attend the Zubatov meetings* in order to fight Zubatovism and to withdraw the workers from its clutches. Babushkin had no more connection with Zubatov than Loriot with Berne.

IV

The second conclusion is that the Third, Communist, International has been formed so as to prevent "socialists" from confining themselves to the *verbal* recognition of

revolution, examples of which are provided by Ramsay MacDonald in his article. Verbal recognition of revolution, which in fact concealed a thoroughly opportunist, reformist, nationalist, petty-bourgeois policy, was the basic sin of the Second International, and we are waging a life-and-death struggle against this evil.

When it is said that the Second International died after suffering shameful bankruptcy, one must be able to understand what this means. It means that opportunism, reformism, petty-bourgeois socialism went bankrupt and died. For the Second International rendered historic service, it has achievements to its credit that are *εἰς αἰῶν* (everlasting) and which the class-conscious worker will never renounce—the creation of mass working-class organisations—co-operative, trade union and political—the utilisation of the bourgeois parliamentary system, and of all the institutions in general of bourgeois democracy, etc.

In order to really defeat opportunism, which caused the shameful death of the Second International, in order to really assist the revolution, the approach of which *even* Ramsay MacDonald is obliged to admit, it is necessary:

Firstly, to conduct all propaganda and agitation from the viewpoint of revolution as opposed to reforms, systematically explaining to the masses, both theoretically and practically, at every step of parliamentary, trade union, co-operative, etc., activity, that they are diametrically opposed. Under no circumstances to refrain (save in special cases, by way of exception) from utilising the parliamentary system and all the "liberties" of bourgeois democracy; not to reject reforms, but to regard them *only* as a *by-product* of the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat. Not a single party affiliated to the Berne International meets these requirements. Not a single one of them shows that it has any idea of how to conduct its propaganda and agitation *as a whole*, explaining how reform *differs* from revolution; nor do they know how to train both the Party and the masses *unswervingly for revolution*.

Secondly, legal work must be combined with *illegal* work. The Bolsheviks have always taught this, and did so with particular insistence during the war of 1914-18. The heroes of despicable opportunism ridiculed this and smugly extolled

the "legality", "democracy", "liberty" of the West-European countries, republics, etc. Now, however, only out-and-out swindlers, who deceive the workers with phrases, can deny that the Bolsheviks proved to be right. In every single country in the world, even the most advanced and "freest" of the bourgeois republics, bourgeois terror reigns, and there is no such thing as freedom to carry on agitation for the socialist revolution, to carry on propaganda and organisational work precisely in this sense. The party which to this day has not admitted this under the rule of the bourgeoisie and does not carry on systematic, all-sided *illegal* work in spite of the laws of the bourgeoisie and of the bourgeois parliaments is a party of traitors and scoundrels who deceive the people by their verbal recognition of revolution. The place for such parties is in the yellow, Berne International. There is no room for them in the Communist International.

Thirdly, unswerving and ruthless war must be waged for the expulsion from the labour movement of all those opportunist leaders who exposed themselves both before and particularly during the war, both in the political sphere and particularly in the trade unions, and the co-operatives. The theory of "neutrality" is a false and despicable evasion, which helped the bourgeoisie to capture the masses in 1914-18. Parties which stand for revolution in words but in deeds fail to carry on undeviating work to spread the influence of precisely the revolutionary and only of the revolutionary party in every sort of mass organisation of the workers are parties of traitors.

Fourthly, there must be no toleration of the verbal condemnation of imperialism while no real revolutionary struggle is waged for the liberation of the colonies (and dependent nations) from one's *own* imperialist bourgeoisie. That is hypocrisy. That is the policy of the agents of the bourgeoisie in the labour movement (labour lieutenants of the capitalist class). The British, French, Dutch, Belgian, or other party which is hostile to imperialism in words but in deeds does not wage a revolutionary struggle within "its own" colonies for the *overthrow* of "its own" bourgeoisie, does not systematically assist the *revolutionary* work which has already begun everywhere in the colonies, and does not send arms

and literature to the revolutionary parties in the colonies, is a party of scoundrels and traitors.

Fifthly, the extreme hypocrisy of the parties of the Berne International is to be seen in their typical recognition of revolution in words while they flaunt before the workers high-sounding phrases about recognising revolution but as far as deeds are concerned go no farther than adopting a purely reformist attitude to those beginnings, elements, manifestations of the growth of revolution in all mass actions which break bourgeois laws and go beyond the bounds of all legality, as for example, mass strikes, street demonstrations, soldiers' protests, meetings among the troops, leaflet distribution in barracks, camps, etc.

If you ask any hero of the Berne International whether his party does such systematic work, he will answer you either with evasive phrases to conceal that such work is not being done—his party lacks the organisations and the machinery for doing it, is incapable of doing it—or with declamatory speeches against “*putschism*” (pyrotechnics), “anarchism”, etc. And it is that which constitutes the betrayal of the working class by the Berne International, its actual desertion to the camp of the bourgeoisie.

All the scoundrelly leaders of the Berne International take great pains to affirm their “sympathy” for revolution in general, and for the Russian revolution in particular. But only hypocrites or simpletons can fail to understand that the particularly rapid successes of the revolution in Russia *are due* to the many years' work by the revolutionary party in the ways indicated; for years illegal machinery was systematically built up to direct demonstrations and strikes, to conduct work among the troops; a detailed study was made of methods; illegal literature was issued summing up experience acquired and educating the whole Party in the idea that revolution was necessary; leaders of the masses were trained for such events, etc., etc.

V

The most profound and radical differences, which sum up all that has been said above and explain the inevitability of an irreconcilable theoretical and practical political strug-

gle of the revolutionary proletariat against the Berne International, centre around two issues—transformation of the imperialist war into civil war, and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The best proof that the Berne International is held captive by bourgeois ideology is its failure to understand (or not desiring to understand, or pretending not to understand) the imperialist character of the war of 1914-18 and the inevitability of its transformation into civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in all the advanced countries.

When the Bolsheviks, as far back as November 1914, pointed to this inevitability, the philistines of all countries retorted with stupid sneers, and among these philistines were all the leaders of the Berne International. Now, the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war has become a fact in a number of countries, not only in Russia but also in Finland, in Hungary, in Germany, and even in neutral Switzerland, and that civil war is maturing is seen, felt, and sensed in all advanced countries without exception.

To ignore this problem now (as Ramsay MacDonald does) or to try to *evade* the issue of the inevitability of civil war with sentimental conciliatory phrases (as Messrs. Kautsky and Co. do) is tantamount to direct betrayal of the proletariat, equivalent to actual desertion to the bourgeoisie. Because the real political leaders of the bourgeoisie have long understood the inevitability of civil war and are making excellent, thoughtful and systematic preparations for it and are strengthening their positions in anticipation of it.

The bourgeoisie of the whole world are exerting all their strength, enormous energy, intellect and determination, hesitating at no crime, and condemning whole countries to famine and complete extinction, in the preparations they are making to crush the proletariat in the impending civil war. The heroes of the Berne International, on the other hand, like simpletons, or hypocritical parsons, or pedantic professors, chant their old, worn-out, threadbare reformist song! No spectacle could be more revolting or more disgusting!

The Kautskys and MacDonalds continue to *frighten* the capitalists with the menace of revolution, to *scare* the bourgeoisie with the menace of civil war in order to obtain concessions from them and get them to agree to follow the

reformist path. This is what all the writings, all the philosophy, all the policy of the entire Berne International amount to. We saw that miserable lackey's trick played in Russia in 1905 by the liberals (Constitutional-Democrats), and in 1917-19 by the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. The servile souls of the Berne International never think of *inculcating upon* the masses the idea of the inevitability and necessity of *defeating* the bourgeoisie in civil war, of pursuing a policy wholly dedicated to this aim, of elucidating, raising and solving all problems from this, and only from this, point of view. That is why our sole aim should be once and for all to push the incorrigible reformists, i.e., nine-tenths of the leaders of the Berne International, into the cesspool of the hirelings of the bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie *needs* hirelings who enjoy the trust of a section of the working class, whitewash and prettify the bourgeoisie with talk about the reformist path being possible, throw dust in the eyes of the people by such talk, and *divert* the people from revolution by giving glowing descriptions of the charms and possibilities of the reformist path.

All the writings of the Kautskys, and of our Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, boil down to such whitewashing and to the whining of the cowardly philistine who fears revolution.

We cannot repeat here in detail the main economic causes that have made the revolutionary (and only the revolutionary) path inevitable, and have made impossible any solution other than civil war to the problems history has placed on the order of the day. Volumes must and will be written about this. If the Kautskys and other leaders of the Berne International do not understand this, all that can be said is ignorance is closer to the truth than prejudice.

Now, after the war, ignorant but sincere men of labour and supporters of the working people, understand the inevitability of revolution, of civil war and of the dictatorship of the proletariat far more easily than do the gentlemen stuffed with most learned reformist prejudices, the Kautskys, MacDonalds, Vanderveldes, Brantings, Turatis, and *tutti quanti*.*

* All the others.—Ed.

As one of the particularly striking confirmations of the phenomenon observable everywhere, on a mass scale, namely, that of the growth of revolutionary consciousness among the masses, we may take the novels of Henri Barbusse, *Le Feu* (Under Fire) and *Clarté* (Light). The former has already been translated into all languages, and in France 230,000 copies have been sold. The transformation of an absolutely ignorant rank-and-filer, utterly crushed by philistine ideas and prejudices, into a revolutionary under the influence of the war is depicted with extraordinary power, talent and truthfulness.

The mass of proletarians and semi-proletarians are on our side and are coming over to us by leaps and bounds. The Berne International is a General Staff without an army, and will collapse like a house of cards if thoroughly exposed to the masses.

The name of Karl Liebknecht was used in the whole of the Entente bourgeois press during the war in order to deceive the masses; the French and British imperialist pirates and plunderers were shown as sympathising with this hero, with this "sole honest German", as they said.

Now the heroes of the Berne International belong to the same organisation as the Scheidemanns who engineered the murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, the Scheidemanns who fulfilled the role of worker-executioners and rendered hangman's service to the bourgeoisie. In words—hypocritical attempts to "condemn" the Scheidemanns (as if "condemning" makes any difference!). In deeds—belonging to the same organisation as the murderers do.

In 1907 the late Harry Quelch was expelled by the German Government from Stuttgart for describing a gathering of European diplomats as a "thieves' supper".⁸⁰ The leaders of the Berne International are not only participants in a thieves' supper, but even in a vile assassins' supper.

They will not escape the justice of the revolutionary workers.

VI

Ramsay MacDonald disposes of the problem of the dictatorship of the proletariat in a couple of words as if it were a subject for a discussion on freedom and democracy.

But it is not. It is time to act, it is too late for discussions.

The most dangerous thing about the Berne International is its verbal recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat. These people are capable of recognising everything, of signing everything, as long as they can keep at the head of the labour movement. Kautsky now says that he is not opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat! The French social-chauvinists and Centrists put their names to resolutions in favour of the dictatorship of the proletariat!

But they deserve not the slightest confidence.

It is not verbal recognition that is needed, but a complete rupture *in deeds* with the policy of reformism, with prejudices about bourgeois freedom and bourgeois democracy, the pursuit in deeds of the policy of revolutionary class struggle.

Attempts are being made to recognise the dictatorship of the proletariat in words, in order to smuggle in along with it the "will of the majority", "universal suffrage" (this is exactly what Kautsky does), bourgeois parliamentarism, rejection of the idea that the entire bourgeois machinery of state must be destroyed, smashed, blown up. These new evasions, new loopholes of reformism, are most of all to be feared.

The dictatorship of the proletariat would be impossible if the majority of the population did not consist of proletarians and semi-proletarians. Kautsky and Co. try to falsify this truth by arguing that "the vote of the majority" is required for the dictatorship of the proletariat to be recognised as "valid".

Comical pedants! They fail to understand that voting within the bounds, institutions and customs of bourgeois parliamentarism is a *part* of the bourgeois state machinery that has to be broken and smashed from top to bottom *in order* to give effect to the dictatorship of the proletariat, in order to pass from bourgeois democracy to proletarian democracy.

They fail to understand that when history places the dictatorship of the proletariat on the order of the day it is not voting, but civil war that decides *all* serious political problems.

They fail to understand that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the rule of *one* class, which takes into its hands the *entire* machinery of the new state, and which *defeats* the

bourgeoisie and *neutralises* the whole of the petty bourgeoisie—the peasantry, the lower middle class and the intelligentsia.

The Kautskys and MacDonalds recognise the class struggle in words, but in deeds forget about it at the most decisive moment in the history of the struggle for the emancipation of the proletariat—at the moment when, having seized state power, and supported by the semi-proletariat, the proletariat with the aid of this power *continues* the class struggle until *classes are abolished*.

Like real philistines, the leaders of the Berne International repeat bourgeois-democratic catchwords about freedom, equality and democracy, but fail to see that they are repeating fragments of ideas concerning the free and equal *commodity owner*, fail to understand that the proletariat needs a state not for the “freedom”, but *for the suppression* of its enemy, the exploiter, the capitalist.

The freedom and equality of the *commodity owner* are as dead as capitalism. And the Kautskys and MacDonalds will never be able to revive it.

The proletariat needs the abolition of classes—such is the *real* content of proletarian democracy, of proletarian freedom (freedom *from* the capitalist, from commodity exchange), of proletarian equality (not equality of *classes*—that is the banality which the Kautskys, Vanderveldes and MacDonalds slip into—but the equality of the working people who *overthrow* capital and capitalism).

So long as classes exist the freedom and equality of classes is a bourgeois deception. The proletariat takes power, becomes the *ruling* class, smashes bourgeois parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy, suppresses the bourgeoisie, suppresses *all* the attempts of *all* other classes to return to capitalism, gives *real* freedom and equality to the working people (which is practicable only when the private ownership of the means of production *has been abolished*), and gives them not only the “right to”, but the *real* use of, *what has been taken* from the bourgeoisie.

He who fails to understand *this* content of the dictatorship of the proletariat (or what is the same thing, Soviet power, or proletarian democracy) is misusing the term dictatorship of the proletariat.

I cannot here develop these ideas in greater detail; I have done so in *The State and Revolution* and in the pamphlet *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*. I shall conclude by dedicating these remarks to the delegates to the Lucerne Congress⁸¹ (August 10, 1919) of the Berne International.

July 14, 1919

Published in August 1919

Published according to
the manuscript

**SPEECH ON THE DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN SITUATION
DELIVERED TO A RED ARMY CONFERENCE HELD
IN KHODYNSKOYE CAMP
JULY 15, 1919**

BRIEF NEWSPAPER REPORT

Lenin's appearance on the platform was greeted by a storm of applause. Lenin said that they were living at an important moment—the concluding stage of the imperialist war. After the defeat of Germany in November 1918, all the Allies had been busy drawing up peace terms and saying that German imperialism was dead and the peoples had been liberated. The National Assembly had ratified the Treaty and peace had been established after a war in which ten million people had died and twenty million had been maimed 'for gain, for purposes of plunder.

After the conclusion of the Treaty of Versailles the Bolsheviks were proved to have been right—the Treaty of Versailles was worse than the Treaty of Brest that Soviet Russia had at one time concluded with moribund German imperialism. It was becoming clearer and clearer that the day of the Treaty of Versailles would be the day of defeat for British, American and any other imperialism. Immediately the Treaty had been signed the imperialists became busy dividing up the colonies; Britain had taken Persia; Syria and Turkey were being carved up, and the eyes of the workers in capitalist countries had been opened to the fact that the war had been a war between predators. Strange as it might have seemed, information had been received to the effect that Prince Lvov, a former member of Kerensky's Provisional Government who was then in Paris, was demanding that

the Allies give Constantinople and the Straits to Russia on the grounds that Russia had fought in the war only for their sake—naturally this naïve demand received an answer to the effect that they would be given only to old, powerful Russia.

In order to hoodwink the people, the French imperialists had appointed July 14, the anniversary of the capture of the Bastille, as the day on which to celebrate victory over Germany. The French workers, however, had not taken the bait, and on July 14 café and restaurant employees had declared a strike—on the day on which the streets are usually filled with carnival crowds and people dancing all the cafés and restaurants were closed and there was no celebration. British, French and Italian workers had declared a general strike for July 21st and one could say that for France and Britain the Treaty of Versailles would end with a defeat of the capitalists and a victory of the proletariat in the same way as the Treaty of Brest had for Germany. The failure of the first Entente offensive in the South of Russia and of the second offensive in Siberia were an indication of this movement of the proletariat in the West, and showed that the proletariat were for Soviet Russia.

The peasantry of Siberia and the Ukraine, who had formerly given their support to Kolchak and Denikin had turned against them after imposition of taxes, wholesale plunder and violence. It had become clear that Kolchak was finished and that victory over Denikin was near; this victory would end with the victory of the proletariat in the West, for the working-class movement in the West was acquiring a Bolshevik character, and although Russia and her Soviet power had at first been alone, she had later been joined by Soviet Hungary. Events were moving towards the transfer of power to the Workers' Councils in Germany and the day was not far distant when all Europe would be united in a single Soviet republic that would remove the rule of the capitalists throughout the world. (*Prolonged applause.*)

ANSWERS TO AN AMERICAN JOURNALIST'S QUESTIONS⁸³

I answer the five questions put to me on condition of the fulfilment of the written promise that my answers will be printed in full in over a hundred newspapers in the United States of America.

1. The governmental programme of the Soviet Government was not a reformist, but a revolutionary one. Reforms are concessions obtained from a ruling class that retains its rule. Revolution is the overthrow of the ruling class. Reformist programmes, therefore, usually consist of many items of partial significance. Our revolutionary programme consisted properly of one general item—removal of the yoke of the landowners and capitalists, the overthrow of their power and the emancipation of the working people from those exploiters. This programme we have never changed. Some partial measures aimed at the realisation of the programme have often been subjected to change; their enumeration would require a whole volume. I will only mention that there is one other general point in our governmental programme which has, perhaps, given rise to the greatest number of changes of partial measures. That point is—the suppression of the exploiters' resistance. After the Revolution of October 25 (November 7), 1917 we did not close down even the bourgeois newspapers and there was no mention of terror at all. We released not only many of Kerensky's ministers, but even Krasnov who had made war on us. It was only after the exploiters, i.e., the capitalists, had begun developing their resistance that we began to crush that resistance systematically, applying even terror. This was the proletariat's response to such actions of the bourgeoisie

as the conspiracy with the capitalists of Germany, Britain, Japan, America and France to restore the rule of the exploiters in Russia, the bribery of the Czechoslovaks with Anglo-French money, the bribery of Mannerheim, Denikin and others with German and French money, etc. One of the latest conspiracies leading to "a change"—to put it precisely, leading to increased terror against the bourgeoisie in Petrograd—was that of the bourgeoisie, acting jointly with the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries; their conspiracy concerned the surrender of Petrograd, the seizure of Krasnaya Gorka by officer-conspirators, the bribing by British and French capitalists of employees of the Swiss Embassy and of many Russian employees, etc.

2. The activities of our Soviet Republic in Afghanistan, India and other Moslem countries outside Russia are the same as our activities among the numerous Moslems and other non-Russian peoples inside Russia. We have made it possible, for instance, for the Bashkirian people to establish an autonomous republic within Russia, we are doing everything possible to help the independent, free development of every nationality, the growth and dissemination of literature in the native language of each of them, we are translating and propagandising our Soviet Constitution which has the misfortune to be more pleasing to more than a thousand million inhabitants of the earth who belong to colonial, dependent, oppressed, underprivileged nations than the constitutions of the West-European and American bourgeois-"democratic" states that perpetuate private property in land and capital, i.e., strengthen the oppression of the working people of their own countries and of hundreds of millions of people in the colonies of Asia, Africa, etc., by a small number of "civilised" capitalists.

3. As far as the United States and Japan are concerned, our first political objective is to repulse their shameless, criminal, predatory invasion of Russia that serves only to enrich their capitalists. We have many times made solemn proposals of peace to both these countries, but they have not even answered us and continue to make war on us, helping Denikin and Kolchak, plundering Murmansk and Archangel, ruining and laying waste to, especially, Eastern Siberia, where the Russian peasants are offering heroic resistance to

the capitalist bandits of Japan and the United States of America.

We have one further political and economic objective in respect of all peoples—including those of the United States and Japan—fraternal alliance with the workers and all working people of all countries without exception.

4. We have, on many occasions, given a precise, clear and written exposition of the terms upon which we agree to conclude peace with Kolchak, Denikin and Mannerheim—for instance to Bullitt⁸⁴ who conducted negotiations with us (and with me personally in Moscow) on behalf of the United States Government, in a letter to Nansen,⁸⁵ etc. It is not our fault that the governments of the United States and other countries are afraid to publish those documents in full and that they hide the truth from the people. I will mention only our basic condition; we are prepared to pay all debts to France and other countries provided there is a real peace and not peace in words alone, i.e., if it is formally signed and ratified by the governments of Great Britain, France, the United States, Japan and Italy—Denikin, Kolchak, Mannerheim and the others being mere pawns in the hands of those governments.

5. More than anything else I should like to state the following to the American public:

Compared to feudalism, capitalism was an historical advance along the road of "liberty", "equality", "democracy" and "civilisation". Nevertheless capitalism was, and remains, a system of *wage-slavery*, of the enslavement of millions of working people, workers and peasants, by an insignificant minority of modern slave-owners, landowners and capitalists. Bourgeois democracy, as compared to feudalism, has changed the form of this economic slavery, has created a brilliant screen for it but has not, and could not, change its essence. Capitalism and bourgeois democracy are wage-slavery.

The gigantic progress of technology in general, and of means of transport in particular, and the tremendous growth of capital and banks have resulted in capitalism becoming mature and overmature. It has outlived itself. It has become the most reactionary hindrance to human progress. It has become reduced to the absolute power of a handful of

millionaires and multimillionaires who send whole nations into a bloodbath to decide whether the German or the Anglo-French group of plunderers is to obtain the spoils of imperialism, power over the colonies, financial "spheres of influence" or "mandates to rule", etc.

During the war of 1914-18 tens of millions of people were killed or mutilated for that reason and for that reason alone. Knowledge of this truth is spreading with indomitable force and rapidity among the working people of all countries, the more so because the war has everywhere caused unparalleled ruin, and because interest on war debts has to be paid *everywhere*, even by the "victor" nations. What is this interest? It is a tribute of thousands of millions to the millionaire gentlemen who were kind enough to allow tens of millions of workers and peasants to kill and maim one another to settle the question of the division of profits by the capitalists.

The collapse of capitalism is inevitable. The revolutionary consciousness of the masses is everywhere growing; there are thousands of signs of this. One small sign, unimportant, but impressive to the man in the street, is the novels written by Henri Barbusse (*Le Feu*, *Clarté*) who was a peaceful, modest, law-abiding petty bourgeois, a philistine, a man in the street, when he went to the war.

The capitalists, the bourgeoisie, can at "best" put off the victory of socialism in one country or another at the cost of slaughtering further hundreds of thousands of workers and peasants. But they cannot save capitalism. The *Soviet Republic* has come to take the place of capitalism, the Republic which gives power to the working people and only to the working people, which entrusts the proletariat with the guidance of their liberation, which abolishes private property in land, factories and other means of production, because this private property is the source of the exploitation of the many by the few, the source of mass poverty, the source of predatory wars between nations, wars that enrich only the capitalists.

The victory of the world Soviet republic is certain.

A brief illustration in conclusion: the American bourgeoisie are deceiving the people by boasting of the liberty, equality and democracy of their country. But neither this

nor any other bourgeoisie nor any government in the world can accept, it is afraid to accept, a contest with our government on the basis of real liberty, equality and democracy; let us suppose that an agreement ensured our government and any other government freedom to exchange ... pamphlets published in the name of the government in any language and containing the text of the laws of the given country, the text of its constitution, and an explanation of its superiority over the others.

Not one bourgeois government in the world would dare conclude such a peaceful, civilised, free, equal, democratic treaty with us.

Why? Because all of them, with the exception of Soviet governments, keep in power by the oppression and deception of the masses. But the great war of 1914-18 exposed the great deception.

Lenin

July 20, 1919

Pravda No. 162,
July 25, 1919

Published according to
the *Pravda* text

THE FOOD AND WAR SITUATION

SPEECH AT A MOSCOW CONFERENCE OF FACTORY COMMITTEES,
TRADE UNIONS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MOSCOW
CENTRAL WORKERS' CO-OPERATIVE
JULY 30, 1919

(*Applause.*) Comrades, I should like to give you a brief, summarised explanation of the food situation and the war situation. I expect that you are all familiar with the main facts in these spheres and my job seems to be to throw some light on the significance of those facts.

At this very moment when you have to settle problems of the co-operatives we are experiencing a moment of difficulty similar to that of last summer, especially in regard to food. You know that our food policy has been a great success during the past year as compared with that of the previous year. It is hardly likely that we can measure the success of our Soviet activities in other fields as accurately as we can in the field of food supplies. During the first year of Soviet power—it included the last period of the Kerensky regime—state procurements amounted to only 30 million poods. In the following year we procured 107 million poods despite a worse war situation and worse conditions of access to the best grain-growing regions, since Siberia, the Ukraine and the greater part of the distant South were out of reach. Despite this our grain procurements were, as you see, trebled. Viewed from the standpoint of the food supply apparatus, this was an important success, but from the standpoint of actual food supplies for the non-agricultural districts it is very little; when the food conditions of the non-agricultural population, especially those of the urban working popula-

tion, were given a thorough study, it was found that this spring and summer the urban worker obtained about a half his food from the Commissariat of Food and had to buy the rest on the open market, at Sukharevka, and from the profiteers; furthermore, the first half accounts for one-tenth of the worker's expenditure on food, while for the second half he has to pay nine-tenths. The profiteering gentry, as is to be expected, get nine times as much out of the worker as the state does for grain procured. If we examine the exact figures of our food situation we shall have to admit that we are standing with one foot in the old capitalism, that we have clambered only half-way out of that morass, out of that swamp of profiteering, on to the road of genuine socialist grain procurement, where grain ceases to be a commodity, ceases to be the object of profiteering, the object of and reason for squabbles, for struggle and for the impoverishment of the many. As you see very little has been done insofar as concerns the needs of the non-agricultural and working-class population, but you have only to imagine the difficult conditions under which the work had to be done, with the Civil War going on, when the greater part of the grain-growing regions was not in our hands, to realise that the food supply apparatus has been built up at unusually high speed. I think that everybody will agree with me that in this respect the organisational task, the task of collecting grain from the peasantry in a non-capitalist manner has been an extremely difficult one that cannot be carried out by any change of institutions—to say nothing of a change of government—because it is a task that requires organisational changes, it requires the reorganisation of the basis of farm life that has been built up in the course of hundreds, if not thousands, of years. If, in conditions of absolute peace, we were to be given, say, five years to build up an organisational apparatus that would be capable of gathering all the grain into the hands of the state and keeping it out of the hands of profiteers, we would say that such speed of social and economic reorganisation is something unprecedented, something unheard of. If we, however, have been able to solve half the problem in less than two years we have done a lot. This is indisputable proof that Soviet power has taken the right line on the food problem, the most

difficult and burdensome of problems, and is on the right road. In any case, I can tell you that Soviet power has decided with the greatest firmness to continue only in this way and not to be put off by the waverings, doubts and criticisms and, sometimes, even the despair we see around us. It is no wonder that we witness the most terrible, tormenting despair among people in the hungry places. It is no wonder, because the figures I have quoted on the food obtained by workers in the non-agricultural and urban regions show that they are dependent on profiteers, on chance, and so on, for half their food.

You know that food profiteering in our country has taken on the character of a fierce struggle and sheer plunder on the part of those who have had an opportunity of getting produce to the market. It is not surprising that we meet with despair among those who have gone under in this savage struggle between the profiteers and the hungry. It is obvious that under prevailing conditions, when the railways are working badly, when typical of the chief grain-growing districts is what is happening in the Ukraine, where we have not succeeded in getting an apparatus going, where the remnants of guerrilla methods prevent any possibility of organisational work, where the population has not yet been able to abandon guerrilla methods—obviously all this is to the advantage of Denikin who has scored his easiest victories there, and makes it more difficult for us to make use of the rich grain markets where there are stocks of grain that could easily get us out of our difficulties. I repeat, that under these circumstances it is no wonder that all around we meet expressions of despair from those who have suffered the greatest loss in this battle for bread. If we take the development of Soviet work in its totality and not in individual cases, and compare what was provided by Soviet power with what was provided by the free market, we shall have to admit that the half of the food supply business in the hands of the profiteers is still the source of fierce oppression and the most fantastic, most disgraceful, absolutely uncontrolled profit for the speculators, and this in circumstances when there are, on the one hand, hungry people, and, on the other hand, opportunities for some people to make a profit—it is a source of the most infamous corruption.

It can be understood that people who are unable to grasp this process in all its aspects should, in many cases, instead of thinking about how to solve this new problem in the struggle against capitalism—the organised procurement of grain at fixed prices due to confidence in the workers' state—instead of giving thought to this they say to us, "Look, if the worker spends nine-tenths of his money on Sukharevka that shows that you exist only owing to food profiteers and speculators. And so you have to conform to it." We sometimes hear this from people who think they have their wits about them and have a profound understanding of events. Actually they are indulging in sophistry. The experience of the revolution shows that changes in the form of government are not difficult, that it is possible to oust the ruling class of landowners and capitalists in a short time, if the revolution develops successfully it may be done in a few weeks, but the reorganisation of the fundamental conditions of economic life, the struggle against habits that in the course of hundreds and thousands of years have become second nature to every petty proprietor is something that requires many long years of persistent organisational work after the exploiting classes have been completely overthrown. And when they point out that alongside us Sukharevka is thriving, and tell us how much Soviet power depends on that market, we ask them what they are surprised at. Could the problem possibly have been solved in a period of less than two years with Russia cut off from the best agricultural regions? Those people who most of all object from the standpoint of principle and who even at times assert that they are speaking from a socialist angle—but God save us from such socialism—accuse the Bolsheviks of utopianism and adventurism because the Bolsheviks said that they could and should not only smash the monarchy and landed proprietorship in a revolutionary manner, but they could and should smash the capitalist class as well, and sweep them and the remnants of the imperialist war away so as to clear the ground for organisational work which will require a lengthy period of working-class rule, the only form of rule capable of giving a lead to the peasant masses. Those people who accuse us of utopianism because we recognised the possibility of smashing the capitalist and landowning classes in a revolutionary manner, are themselves

imposing a utopian task upon us by wanting the organisational questions of the new socialist system and the struggle against old customs that cannot be overcome by any abolition of institutions—by wanting these problems settled at a moment when our hands are tied by the Civil War and wanting them settled in a period too brief for their solution by any earthly forces.

Yes, it is the food policy that demonstrates most clearly that the struggle between socialism and capitalism in its latest form is being fought out right here where we not only have to overcome old institutions, not only the landowners and capitalists, but all the habits and economic conditions, created by capitalism, affecting millions of petty proprietors. We have to make reason stronger than their prejudices. Any peasant who is at all class-conscious will agree that freedom to trade in grain and the sale of grain on the open market when the people are hungry means war between people and the enrichment of the profiteers, while for the masses of the people it means hunger. This class-consciousness, however, is not enough because all the peasant's prejudices and all his habits tell him that it is more profitable to sell grain to a profiteer for several hundred rubles than to give it to the state for a few dozen paper rubles that he cannot get anything for at the moment. We say that since the country is ruined, since there is no fuel and the factories are at a standstill, you, the peasant, must help the workers' state, you must give up your grain as a loan. The paper money you are being given for your grain certifies that you have made the state a loan. And if you, the peasant, make the state a loan and give up your grain, the worker will be able to rehabilitate industry. There is no other way of rehabilitating industry in a country that has been ruined by four years of imperialist war and two years of civil war—there is no other way! Any peasant who is a little bit developed and has emerged from his primordial muzhik darkness will agree that there is no other way. But the class-conscious peasant that you can convince if you speak to him as man to man is one thing and the prejudices of millions of peasants are another; they understand that they have lived under capitalism all their lives and consider they are justified in regarding the grain as their property—they have not had any

experience of the new order and cannot put their trust in it. That is why we say that precisely in this sphere, in the matter of food, there is the most bitter war between capitalism and socialism, a war in actual fact and not merely in words and not in the upper echelons of state organisation. Those upper echelons are easily reorganised, and the significance of such changes is not very great. But here the consciousness of the working people and of their vanguard, the working class, is fighting the last, decisive battle against the prejudices and disunity of the peasant masses. When the advocates of capitalism—no matter whether they call themselves representatives of bourgeois parties, or Mensheviks, or Socialist-Revolutionaries—when they say, "Renounce the implementation of the state grain monopoly, the compulsory requisitioning of grain at fixed prices," we answer them by saying, "You, dear Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, you are perhaps sincere people, but you are defenders of capitalism, you preach nothing but the prejudices of the old, petty-bourgeois democracy that knows nothing but freedom to trade, that stands aside from the fierce war against capitalism and considers that all this can be amicably settled." We have enough experience and we know that those who really belong to the working masses, those who have not risen to the upper echelons, those who have been exploited by the landowners and capitalists all their lives—they know that here it is a matter of the last, decisive battle against capitalism, a battle that does not allow of any conciliation. They know that there cannot be any concessions here, in this particular sphere. When Soviet power said that temporarily—as it did last summer—for so many weeks people would be allowed to carry with them one and a half poods of grain, the food apparatus that was later set working procured more than before. You know that at the present time we have had to make a similar concession and allow such an interval—let the worker during his holidays get his own supplies. By this we are giving ourselves greater opportunities to renew our work and guarantee our socialist activities. We are fighting a real battle against capitalism and we assert that no matter what concessions capitalism may force us to make we are still in favour of the struggle against it and against exploitation. We shall fight in this field as ruthlessly as we are

fighting Denikin and Kolchak, because they draw fresh strength for themselves from the might of capitalism, and this might, of course, does not fall from the sky, it is based on freedom to trade in grain and other goods. We know that one of the main sources of capitalism is freedom to trade in grain in the country, and it is this source that has been the ruin of all previous republics. Today the last, decisive battle against capitalism and against freedom to trade is being fought and for us this is a truly basic battle between capitalism and socialism. If we win in this fight there will be no return to capitalism and the former system, no return to what has been in the past. Such a return will be impossible so long as there is a war against the bourgeoisie, against profiteering and against petty proprietorship, and as long as the principle "every man for himself and God for all" is not retained. We have to forget the principle that every peasant should be for himself and Kolchak for all. We now have a new type of relations and of organisation. It must be remembered that socialism is progressing and no matter to what extent we impose remnants of the old on ourselves they will be nothing but old fragments of old ideas because the peasant must have a completely different attitude to the article of consumption he produces; if, on the other hand, he sells food to workers at uncontrolled prices he will most certainly become a bourgeois and a property-owner, but we say that food must be sold at fixed state prices so that we shall have an opportunity to get away from capitalism. And now that we have to live through this difficult period of hunger and compare the present situation with last year's we have to admit that the situation this year is incomparably better than it was last year. It is true that we have to make certain concessions, but we can always answer for them and explain them. But still, although we have done a lot in twenty months of Soviet power we have not yet found a way out of all the difficulties of the present grave situation.

When we have got the peasant away from his property and when we have made him turn towards the work of our state we shall be able to say that we have covered a difficult section of our road. But we shall not deviate from that road, any more than we shall deviate from the road of struggle against Denikin and Kolchak. We hear such things from those

people who call themselves Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks as "the war is hopeless", "there is no way out of the war and we must make every effort to end it"—you will hear such things said everywhere. People say this who do not understand the real state of affairs. They think the Civil War is hopeless because it is too burdensome, but can they not understand that the war is being forced on us by European imperialists because they are afraid of Soviet Russia? Furthermore, they have in their palaces, today Savinkov, tomorrow Maklakov and then Breshkovskaya—and they have not got them there for gossip, they talk to them about the most rational way of sending soldiers and guns and other death-dealing weapons here, to us, how to send help to the Archangel Front, how to link it up with the Southern and Eastern fronts and even the Petrograd Front. All Europe, and all the European bourgeoisie have taken up arms against Soviet Russia. They have become so insolent that they even make such proposals to the Hungarian Government as, "You reject Soviet power and we'll give you bread." I am thinking that the proposal will serve as powerful propaganda in Hungary when they read about it in the Budapest newspapers! Nevertheless it is better and more frank and honest than all the chiromancy about the struggle for freedom to trade, etc. Here the issue is clear—you need bread, reject whatever is not to our advantage and we will give you the bread.

If, therefore, the kind capitalists were to turn to the Russian peasants with the same proposal we would be very grateful to them. We should be able to say that we are short of propagandists but now Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Wilson have come to our aid and have shown themselves to be the best propagandists. There would 'not be any more speeches about the Constituent Assembly, about freedom of assembly, etc., everything would be above-board. But we shall ask the capitalist gentry—you have so many war debts, your bags are packed tight with promissory notes for so many thousand millions of war debts—do you think the people are going to pay them? You have so many shells, cartridges, guns, that you don't now what to do with them—was firing at Russian workers the best thing you could think of? You bought Kolchak, why didn't you save him? You recently

passed a resolution to the effect that the international League of Nations of the Allied powers recognised Kolchak as the only authoritative Russian ruler.⁸⁶ And after that nothing was seen of Kolchak but a pair of clean heels. Why did that happen? (*Applause.*) And so we see from the experience of Kolchakia what the promises of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik leaders are worth. Did not they begin the Kolchak campaign? They held power in Samara. What are their promises worth? And what are we to do if they gather against us forces that from the military point of view are, of course, immeasurably superior to ours—we cannot make even an approximate comparison? The bourgeoisie, great and small, naturally draw the relevant conclusion from this and they say to the weary, hungry masses, "You have been dragged into a civil war from which there is no way out. How can your backward, weary country fight against Britain, France and America?" We are constantly hearing this tune sung all round us—we hear it daily and hourly from the bourgeois intelligentsia. They are trying to prove that the Civil War is a hopeless business. We can find the answer in history—the history of the government in Siberia. We know that there are affluent peasants living there who have never known serfdom and who cannot, therefore, show gratitude to the Bolsheviks for liberating them from the landowners. We know that a government was organised there and that for a start some beautiful banners prepared by the Socialist-Revolutionary Chernov and the Menshevik Maisky were sent there; these banners bore such slogans as "Constituent Assembly", "Freedom to Trade"—they were willing to inscribe on them everything the ignorant peasant wanted so long as he would help them overthrow the Bolsheviks! And what happened to that government? Instead of a Constituent Assembly they got Kolchak's dictatorship, the worst possible, worse than any tsarist dictatorship. Was that an accident? We are told that it was a mistake. Gentlemen—individuals may make mistakes in some act or another in their lives, but here you had the aid of all the best people, the best there were in your parties. Did you not have the help of the intelligentsia? Even if they were not there—and we know that they were—you still had the intelligentsia of all the advanced countries—France, Britain, America and Japan. You

had land, you had a fleet, you had an army and you had money—why, then, did everything collapse? Was it because of a mistake that was made by some Chernov or Maisky? No, it was because there cannot be any middle way in this desperate war, and in order to hold out the bourgeoisie has to shoot down by scores and hundreds the very best of the working class. This is clear from the example of Finland, and now Siberia is showing another example of it. In order to prove the rootless nature of the Bolsheviks, the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks began organising a new power and flopped with it triumphantly directly at the feet of Kolchak's government. That was no accident, for the same thing is happening all over the world, and if all the Bolshevik speeches were to disappear, and with them all their printed publications that are being persecuted in every country where Bolshevik pamphlets are being fished out as something infectious and dangerous to poor Wilson, Clemenceau and Lloyd George—if all that were to disappear we would point to Siberia where their henchmen have only just been operating and we would say, "Here is what works better than any agitation!" This shows that there can be no middle way between the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and the dictatorship of the working class. This is an argument that is penetrating into the heads of the least class-conscious of the peasants to say nothing of the working class. You know that the peasants said that they did not want a Bolshevik government, they wanted freedom to trade in grain. You know that in Samara the peasantry, the middle peasants, were on the side of the bourgeoisie. Who has now driven them away from Kolchak? It seems that the peasant alone cannot create his own....* This is confirmed by the entire history of revolution, and anybody who is familiar with it and with the history of the socialist movement knows that the development of political parties in the nineteenth century leads to this.

The peasant, of course, did not know this. He has never studied the history of socialism or the history of revolution but he recognises and believes in arguments derived from his own experience. When he saw that Bolshevik-imposed hardships were for the sake of victory over the exploiters, and

* This word could not be deciphered in the shorthand notes.—*Ed.*

that Kolchak's government brought back capitalism with its old policemen, he said, fully conscious of what he was saying, "I choose the dictatorship of the working-class masses and will go so far as to help in the full defeat of the dictatorship of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie (that is what he calls Kolchak's dictatorship) so that there will be the dictatorship of the proletariat, the dictatorship of the people." The history of Kolchak shows that no matter how long the Civil War may last, how difficult it may be and how hopeless it may seem, it will not lead us into a blind alley. It will lead the masses of the people, those that are farthest removed from the Bolsheviks, to believe through their own experience in the need to go over to the side of Soviet power.

And that, comrades, is the war situation. Now allow me to finish up my report by some indications of the co-operative work that we have before us. Many comrades have spoken who are more competent than I to appraise the practical tasks with which you are faced. I will allow myself to express the hope that the task you have to undertake—the creation of a consumers' co-operative society that embraces the masses of the working people—that this tremendously important task will be carried out successfully. In the conditions of capitalist society the co-operatives naturally produced a top group that formed their leadership, and this top layer were all whiteguards. It turned out this way not only in our country; it was proved by the co-operative leaders who concluded an agreement with Kolchak. It was the same in Britain and Germany, in capitalist countries. When the war broke out, the upper strata of the co-operatives who were accustomed to a luxurious way of life, went over to the imperialists.

It is no accident that throughout the world the upper echelons of the socialist parliamentarians, the upper echelons of the socialist movement went over entirely to the imperialists during the imperialist war. They helped start the war, and they have gone so far that their friends head the government that murdered Liebknecht and Luxemburg and are helping shoot the leaders of the working class. This is not the fault of individual people. It is not the crime of any unfortunate criminal. It is the result of capitalism that has corrupted them. That is how it was everywhere in the

world, and Russia is no holy land; we could not get out of capitalist society in any other way than by engaging in a serious war with those upper echelons. It is still not over today, when it embraces the masses of the people and the masses have arisen in struggle against all forms of profiteering. Those who have personally experienced exploitation will not forget it when they take the business of distribution into their own hands. It is possible that in this field we shall suffer quite a few defeats. We know that in this field there is a great deal of backwardness and ignorance and that we shall fail, first in one place and then in another—we know that we cannot achieve anything at a single blow. But we who are conscientiously carrying on Soviet work, we, class-conscious workers and peasants who are organising socialist Russia, shall continue that war. You will pursue this war together with us, and we shall end that war, difficult as it may be, with full victory, comrades. (*Applause.*)

Brief report published in
Pravda No. 167, July 31, 1919

Published according to
the shorthand notes

**SPEECH AT THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS
OF WORKERS IN EDUCATION
AND SOCIALIST CULTURE
JULY 31, 1919 ⁸⁷**

Comrades, it gives me great pleasure to greet your Congress in the name of the Council of People's Commissars.

In the sphere of education we have long had to struggle against the same difficulties that Soviet power encounters in all spheres of work and in all spheres of organisation. We saw that organisations regarded as the only mass organisations were from the very outset headed by people who, for a lengthy period, were under the influence of bourgeois prejudices. In the first days of Soviet power, in October 1917, we even saw how the army swamped us in Petrograd with declarations to the effect that it did not recognise Soviet power, threatened to go against Petrograd and expressed solidarity with bourgeois governments. As long ago as that we were sure that these declarations came from the top people in these organisations, from the army committees of that time, who represented the past in the development of the moods, convictions and views of our army. The situation has since then repeated itself in all mass organisations—in respect of the railway proletariat, and again in respect of the post and telegraph employees. We have always noted that at first the past maintains its power and influence over mass organisations. We were, therefore, not at all surprised at the lengthy and stubborn struggle that went on among the school-teachers, the majority of whom, if not all, from the very beginning took a stand hostile to Soviet power. We saw how we gradually had to overcome bourgeois prejudices

and how the school-teachers, who were closely connected with the workers and labouring peasantry, had to struggle against the former bourgeois system to win for themselves rights and to break a road to a genuine rapprochement with the working masses, to a genuine understanding of the nature of the socialist revolution that was under way. Until now you have had more than anybody else to deal with the old prejudices of the bourgeois intelligentsia, with their usual methods and arguments, with their defence of bourgeois or capitalist society, with their struggle, not usually direct but carried on under cover of some outwardly pleasant slogans which are advanced to defend capitalism in one way or another.

Comrades, you may remember how Marx describes the way the worker got to the modern capitalist factory, how he analysed the enslavement of the worker in a disciplined, cultured and "free" capitalist society, studied the causes of the oppression of labour by capital, how he approached the fundamentals of the production process, how he described the worker's entry into a capitalist factory where the robbery of surplus-value takes place and the foundation of capitalist exploitation is laid down, where capitalist society is built, the society that gives riches to the few and holds the many in a state of oppression. When Marx reached this most significant, most fundamental place in his book—the analysis of capitalist exploitation—he accompanied his introduction to this analysis with the ironical remark that the place he was taking the reader to, the place where profit was extracted by the capitalists, was the place where liberty, equality and Bentham ruled.⁸⁸ By this Marx stressed the ideology upheld by the bourgeoisie in capitalist society and which they justify because from their point of view, from the point of view of the bourgeoisie who had won the fight against the feudals, "Liberty, Equality and Bentham" ruled in capitalist society which was based on the rule of money, the rule of capital and the exploitation of the working people. What they call liberty is liberty to make profit, liberty for the few to become rich, the liberty of the trade turnover; what they call equality is equality between capitalist and worker; and the rule of Bentham is the rule of the petty-bourgeois prejudice about liberty and equality.

If we look around us, if we take a look at those arguments that were used in the struggle against us yesterday and which are being used today by members of the old teachers' union and which we still meet with among our ideological opponents who call themselves socialists (the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks), those arguments that we meet with in a not very conscious form in our day-to-day talks with the peasant masses who have not yet understood the significance of socialism—if you take a look at and give some thought to the ideological meaning of these arguments you will find the very same bourgeois motif that Marx stressed in *Capital*. All these people reiterate the catch-phrase that Liberty, Equality and Bentham rule in capitalist society. And when objections to us are raised from this point of view and it is said that we, the Bolsheviks and Soviet power, are contravening freedom and equality, we refer those who say so to the elements of political economy, to the basic doctrines of Marx. We maintain that the freedom you accuse the Bolsheviks of contravening is the freedom of capital, the freedom of an owner to sell grain on the open market, i.e., the freedom for the few to make profit, for those who have grain surpluses. That freedom of the press that the Bolsheviks have constantly been accused of having violated—what is this freedom of the press in a capitalist society? Everybody could see what the press was in our "free" Russia. This was seen to a still greater extent by people who were familiar with, have been able to observe closely or had had dealings with press affairs in the advanced capitalist countries. Freedom of the press in capitalist society means freedom to trade in publications and in their influence on the masses. Freedom of the press means that the press, a powerful medium for influencing the masses, is maintained at the expense of the capitalists. Such is the freedom of the press that the Bolsheviks violated and they are proud of having produced the first press free of the capitalists, that in a gigantic country they have for the first time set up a press that does not depend on a handful of rich men and millionaires—a press that is devoted entirely to the struggle against capital, the struggle to which we must subordinate everything. Only the factory proletariat that is capable of leading the peasant masses

that are not class-conscious can be the leader, the vanguard, of the working people in this struggle.

When we are reproached with having established a dictatorship of one party and, as you have heard, a united socialist front is proposed, we say, "Yes, it is a dictatorship of one party! This is what we stand for and we shall not shift from that position because it is the party that has won, in the course of decades, the position of vanguard of the entire factory and industrial proletariat. This party had won that position even before the revolution of 1905. It is the party that was at the head of the workers in 1905 and which since then—even at the time of the reaction after 1905 when the working-class movement was rehabilitated with such difficulty under the Stolypin Duma—merged with the working class and it alone could lead that class to a profound, fundamental change in the old society." When a united socialist front is proposed to us we say that it is the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties that propose it, and that they have wavered in favour of the bourgeoisie throughout the revolution. We have had a double experience—the Kerensky period when the Socialist-Revolutionaries formed a coalition government that was helped by the Entente, that is, by the world bourgeoisie, the imperialists of France, America and Britain. What did that result in? Was there that gradual transition to socialism they had promised? No, there was collapse, the absolute rule of the imperialists, the rule of the bourgeoisie and the complete bankruptcy of all sorts of illusions about class conciliation.

If that experience is not enough, take Siberia. There we saw the same thing happen again. In Siberia the government was against the Bolsheviks. At the beginning the entire bourgeoisie who had fled from Soviet power came to the help of the Czechoslovak uprising and the uprising of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks. They were helped by the entire bourgeoisie and the capitalists of the most powerful countries of Europe and America; their aid was not merely ideological but financial and military aid as well. And what was the result? What came of this rule that was allegedly the rule of the Constituent Assembly, that allegedly democratic government of Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks? It led to the Kolchak gamble. Why did it lead to the

collapse that we have witnessed? Because here we saw the effect of the basic truth, which the so-called socialists from the camp of our opponents do not want to understand, that there can be only one of two possible powers in capitalist society, either the power of the capitalists or the power of the proletariat, no matter whether that society is developing, is firmly on its feet, or is declining. Every middle-of-the-road power is a dream, and every attempt to set up something in between leads only to people, even if they are absolutely sincere, shifting to one side or the other. Only the power of the proletariat, only the rule of the workers can ally to itself the majority of those who work, because the peasant masses, although they constitute a mass of working people, are nevertheless to a certain extent the owners of their small properties, of their own grain. And that is the struggle that has unfolded before our eyes, the struggle which shows how the proletariat, in the course of lengthy political trials, during the changes in governments that we see in various places on the outskirts of Russia, is sweeping away everything that serves exploitation; it shows how the proletariat is breaking its own road and is becoming more and more the genuine, absolute leader of the masses of working people in suppressing and eliminating the resistance of capital.

Those who say that the Bolsheviks violate freedom and who propose the formation of a united socialist front, that is, an alliance with those who vacillated, and twice in the history of the Russian revolution went over to the side of the bourgeoisie—these people are very fond of accusing us of resorting to terror. They say that the Bolsheviks have introduced a system of terror in administration, and if Russia is to be saved, the Bolsheviks must renounce it. This reminds me of a witty French bourgeois who, in his bourgeois manner, said with reference to the abolition of the death penalty, "Let the murderers be the first to abolish the death penalty." I recall this when people say, "Let the Bolsheviks renounce the terror." Let the Russian capitalists and their allies, America, France and Britain, that is, those who first imposed terror on Soviet Russia, let them renounce it! They are the imperialists who attacked us and are still attacking us with all their military might, which is a thousand times greater

than ours. Is it not terror for all the Entente countries, all the imperialists of Britain, France and America, to keep in their capitals servitors of international capital—whether their names are Sazonov or Maklakov—who have organised tens and hundreds of thousands of the dissatisfied, ruined, humiliated and indignant representatives of capital and the bourgeoisie? You must have heard about the plots among the military, you must have read about the latest plot in Krasnaya Gorka, which nearly led to the loss of Petrograd; what was this but a manifestation of terror on the part of the bourgeoisie of the whole world, which will commit any violence, crime and atrocity in order to reinstate the exploiters in Russia and stamp out the flames of the socialist revolution, which is now threatening even their own countries? There is the source of terror, that is where the responsibility lies! That is why we are sure that those who preach renunciation of terror in Russia are nothing but conscious, or unwitting, tools and agents of the imperialist terrorists, who are trying to crush Russia with their blockades and aid to Denikin and Kolchak. But their cause is a hopeless one.

Russia is the country assigned by history the role of trail-blazer of the socialist revolution, and that is just why so much struggle and suffering has fallen to our lot. The capitalists and imperialists of other countries realise that Russia is up in arms, and that the future not only of Russian but of international capital is being decided in Russia. That is why in all their press—in all the bourgeois world press which they have bribed with their many millions—they spread the most incredible slanders about the Bolsheviks.

They are attacking Russia in the name of the selfsame principles of "Liberty, Equality and Bentham". If you come across someone in this country who thinks that when he speaks of freedom and equality and of their violation by the Bolsheviks, he is championing something that is quite independent, the principles of democracy in general, ask him to have a look at the capitalist press of Europe. What is the screen being used by Denikin and Kolchak, what is the screen being used by European capitalists and the bourgeoisie in their efforts to crush Russia? Liberty and equality—that is all they talk about! When the Americans, British

and French seized Archangel, when they sent their troops to the South, they did so in defence of liberty and equality. That is the kind of slogan they use as camouflage, and that is why the proletariat of Russia has risen against world capital in this fierce struggle. Such is the purpose of these slogans of freedom and equality which all agents of the bourgeoisie use to deceive the people, and which intellectuals who really side with the workers and peasants have to expose.

We see that as the attempts of the Entente imperialists become more desperate and vicious they meet with ever greater resistance on the part of the proletariat of their own countries. The first attempt at an international strike by workers in Britain, France and Italy against their governments that was made on July 21 had as its slogan, "Hands off Russia, and an honest peace with the Republic". This strike failed. Separate strikes broke out in Britain, France and Italy. In America and Canada, everything that looks like Bolshevism is fiercely persecuted. In the last few years, we have gone through two great revolutions. We know how hard it was for the vanguard of the Russian working people in 1905 to rise in the struggle against tsarism. We know that after the first bloody lesson of January 9, 1905, the strike movement developed slowly and laboriously until October 1905, when the mass strike scored its first success in Russia. We know how hard the going was. This was proved by the experience of two revolutions, although the situation in Russia was more revolutionary than in other countries. We know with what difficulty the forces for the struggle against capitalism are mobilised in a series of strikes. That is why we are not surprised by the failure of this first international strike of July 21. We know that there is much greater resistance and opposition to the revolution in the European countries than over here. We know that in fixing July 21 as the date for an international strike, the workers of Britain, France and Italy had to overcome incredible difficulties. It was an experiment unparalleled in history. It is not surprising that it failed. But we also know that the working people of the leading and most civilised countries are on our side despite the European bourgeoisie's rabid hatred of us, that they understand our cause, and whatever the hardships of the revolution and the trials ahead, whatever the atmosphere of lies and deception

in the name of the "freedom and equality" of capital, equality of the starved and the overfed, whatever the atmosphere, we know that our cause is the cause of the workers of all countries, and that is why this cause will inevitably defeat international capital.

Pravda No. 170,
August 3, 1919

Published according to
the *Pravda* text

IN THE SERVANTS' QUARTERS

Comrades have brought several Menshevik, Socialist-Revolutionary and other publications from the South that give us a glimpse of the "ideological life" on the *other side* of the barricades, in the *other camp*. The Kharkov *Mysl* of Bazarov and Martov, *Gryadushchy Dyen* run by Myakotin and Peshekhonov, Bunakov and Vishnyak, Potresov and Grossman, *Yuzhnoye Dyelo* and *Obyedineniye* run by Balabanov, S. Ivanovich, Myakotin and Peshekhonov—these are the names of the publications and of some of their best-known contributors.

Even the few haphazard issues of the above-mentioned periodicals produce such a strong and full aroma that one immediately feels that one is in the servants' quarters. Educated intellectuals who imagine they are socialists and call themselves such, saturated through and through with bourgeois prejudices and fawning before the bourgeoisie—such, if we get down to brass tacks, is that entire clique of writers. There are many trends among them but they have no serious meaning from the political point of view for they differ only, in the extent to which they are hypocritical or sincere, crude or astute, clumsy or skilled in doing their servants' duties to the bourgeoisie.

I

The duty of a lackey involves wearing a tail-coat and white gloves and possessing a civilised appearance and the relevant manners. The lackey is permitted to possess a certain love for the people; this, on the one hand, is inevitable because the milieu that provides lackeys must be in needy circum-

stances; on the other hand, it is even to the master's advantage, for it gives him an opportunity to "practise" his philanthropy, in the first place, of course, among those "obedient" sections of the population from which servants, shop assistants and workers are drawn. The cleverer and the better educated the classes that keep servants, the more regularly and thoughtfully they pursue their policy, using their lackeys to spy on the working people, to disunite the working people by granting concessions to a certain part of them, to strengthen their own position and to interest their "faithful servants" in increasing the master's wealth in the hope of receiving a rake-off, etc., etc.

Love for the people is permitted the lackey only to a very modest degree, of course, and only on the imperative condition that he expresses humble and servile feelings in addition to his readiness to comfort the working and exploited people. Let it be said in parenthesis that Feuerbach gave a very neat answer to those who defended religion as a source of comfort for people; to comfort the slave, he said, is to the advantage of the slave-owner, while the real friend of the slaves teaches them indignation and revolt, teaches them to cast off the yoke and does not comfort them. The lackey paints and prettifies the artificial flowers that serve to comfort the slaves who are fettered by wage-slavery. Champions of the emancipation of people from wage-slavery tear away the artificial flowers from the fetters they decorate so that the slave can learn to hate his fetters more consciously and more strongly, the quicker to throw them off and reach out his hand for living flowers.

The necessity to combine a very moderate dose of love for the people with a very big dose of obedience and of protection of the master's interests that is specific to the position of the lackey, inevitably produces the hypocrisy that is typical of the lackey as a social type. Here it is a case of a social type and not of the qualities possessed by individuals. A lackey may be the most honest of men, an exemplary member of his family, an excellent citizen but he is fatally doomed to hypocrisy because the main feature of his trade is the combination of the interests of the master whom he is "pledged to serve truly and faithfully" and those of the milieu from which servants are recruited. If this problem, therefore,

is studied from the political point of view, i.e., from the point of view of millions of people and the relations between millions, one must come to the conclusion that the chief features of the lackey as a social type are hypocrisy and cowardice. These qualities are inculcated by the lackey's trade, and they are the most important from the point of view of the wage-slaves and the mass of working people in any capitalist society.

II

Educated intellectuals who call themselves Mensheviks, Social-Democrats, Socialist-Revolutionaries and what not want to teach the people politics. They had, therefore, to touch upon the fundamental issue of the entire period in which we are living—the conversion of the imperialist war into a civil war. See how they argue on this point.

Mr. P. Yushkevich, writing in *Obyedineniye*, devotes a whole article to "Revolution and Civil War". The class of literature—if such it can be called—to which the article belongs may be judged from just the following two statements of the author's.

"Having as its objective a revolution that is in the interests of the majority and is carried out by that majority, socialism has no grounds [!] to turn to methods [!!!] of the civil war to which a minority that has seized power is fatally doomed...." "The most advanced class of modern society, when it has become sufficiently mature to understand in full its world mission of emancipation and the tasks accompanying it, must throw it (civil war) aside together with other things inherited from historical barbarity...."

A real gem, is it not?

Immediately after the Bolshevik revolution the Russian bourgeoisie started seeking agreements and concluding agreements with the foreign bourgeoisie against the working people of their own country. The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries supported them. The same thing occurred in Finland at the beginning of 1918. And it was the same in the North of Russia and in the South at the beginning of 1918 when the Constitutional-Democrats, Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, in alliance with the Germans, tried to crush the Bolsheviks. The same again in Georgia. The Germans gave Krasnov money and arms. Then the Entente

bourgeoisie bought over the Czechoslovaks and Denikin and landed their troops in Murmansk, Archangel, Siberia, Baku and Ashkhabad.

The world bourgeoisie—at first the German and then the Anglo-French (often both together)—made war on the victorious proletariat of Russia. And then comes this man who calls himself a socialist, who has gone over to the side of the bourgeoisie and who advises the workers “to throw aside” “civil war methods”. Is he not a Judas Golovlyov⁸⁹ of the latest capitalist type?

I shall probably be told that Yushkevich is merely a rank-and-file bourgeois journalistic cooly, that he is not typical of any party and they do not accept responsibility for him. That, however, would not be true. In the first place the entire staff and the trend followed by *Obyedineniye* show that this particular sort of servility is typical of the entire Menshevik-Socialist-Revolutionary brotherhood. In the second place there is the example of L. Martov. This character is a most prominent (and probably the most “Left”) of the Mensheviks and also a highly respected member of the Berne International who is in agreement with its ideological leader, Karl Kautsky.

Take a look at Martov's arguments. In the April 1919 issue of *Mysl* he writes about “world Bolshevism”. He has a thorough knowledge of the literature of Bolshevism and about Bolshevism. And this is what that author writes about civil war:

“In the early days of the war I had occasion to write that the crisis it had called forth in the working-class movement was primarily a ‘moral crisis’, a crisis of the loss of mutual trust between different sections of the proletariat and loss of the faith of the proletarian masses in the old moral and political values. At that time I could not imagine that this loss of mutual trust, this destruction of ideological bonds that for the last decades had united not only reformists and revolutionaries but had, at certain moments, united socialists and anarchists and both of them with liberal and Christian workers—I could not imagine that this destruction would lead to *civil war* between proletarians....”

The italics belong to Mr. Martov. He stresses that here he is appraising specifically civil war. It may even be that he is stressing his full agreement with Kautsky who, in any case, argues in the same way about civil war.

In this argument there is so much refined corruption, such an abyss of lies, deception of the workers, and despicable betrayal of their interests, such a hypocritical attitude to and defection from socialism that one is amazed at the amount of servility the Kautskys and Martovs have accumulated in the course of decades of "playing" with opportunism!

Firstly, when Kautsky and Martov pharisaically shed tears over "civil war *between proletarians*" they are trying to hide their desertion to the side of the bourgeoisie. Actually, the civil war is between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. There never has been in history, nor can there be in a class society, a civil war of the exploited masses against the exploiting minority in which some of the exploited have not gone over to the side of the exploiters and fought with them against their own brothers. Any literate person will admit that a Frenchman who, at the time of the peasant uprising in Vendée in behalf of the monarchy and the landowners, had bewailed the "civil war *between peasants*" would be a lackey of the monarchy, disgusting in his hypocrisy. The Kautskys and Martovs are just such lackeys of the capitalists.

The international bourgeoisie, powerful throughout the world, are crushing the victorious workers of one country for having defeated capital and have the following of some of the deceived, uninformed, downtrodden workers; and such scoundrels as the Kautskys and Martovs are shedding tears over "civil war *between proletarians*". These characters have to resort to such disgusting hypocrisy since they cannot openly admit that they are on the side of the bourgeoisie in the civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie!

In the second place, Martov, like Kautsky and the entire Berne International, knows full well that they enjoyed the sympathy of the workers as socialists because they preached the necessity for proletarian revolution. In 1902 Kautsky wrote about the possible connection between revolution and war and said that the future proletarian revolution would probably coincide with civil war to a greater extent than former revolutions. In 1912 the entire Second International solemnly declared in the Basle Manifesto that the coming war would be connected with the coming proletarian revolution. And when that war broke out the "revolutionaries" of

the Second International turned out to be lackeys of the bourgeoisie!

In November 1914 the Bolsheviks declared that the imperialist war was likely to be transformed into a civil war. This proved to be true. It is now a fact on a world scale. In speaking of world Bolshevism, Martov is compelled to admit this fact. But instead of honestly admitting his complete ideological failure, the collapse of the views of all those who, with the contemptuous grimace of the philistine rejected the idea of turning the imperialist war into a civil war—instead of this Martov “points” hypocritically to the “proletarian masses” who are supposed to have “lost faith in the old moral and political values”!

The renegades are blaming the masses for their own treachery, but the masses sympathise with the Bolsheviks and are everywhere taking the revolutionary path. According to the “theory” of those who all their lives have sworn loyalty to the revolution only to find themselves in the camp of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat when the revolution came, the masses are to blame for this.

In the third place, the two different theories that existed before the war on the question of the internal struggle within socialism were the following. Kautsky and Martov, like most of the opportunists, regarded the reformists and the revolutionaries as two legitimate trends, essential wings of the movement of one class. The divergence of these two trends was condemned. Their rapprochement and merging at every grave moment in the proletarian class struggle was recognised as inevitable. Champions of a split were accused of short-sightedness.

The Bolsheviks had a different view; they regarded the reformists as the vehicle of bourgeois influence among the proletariat, an alliance with them was sanctioned as a temporary evil in situations that were clearly not revolutionary, a break and a split with them was considered inevitable whenever the struggle took on a serious, sharpened form, especially at the beginning of the revolution.

And who proved to be right?

The Bolsheviks.

Throughout the world the war caused a split in the working-class movement when the socialist-patriots went over to the

bourgeoisie. After Russia this was to be seen most clearly in Germany, an advanced capitalist country. To defend the "ideological bonds" of the reformists and revolutionaries today is tantamount to giving support to such hangmen of working-class origin as Noske and Scheidemann, who helped the bourgeoisie murder Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht and kill thousands of workers for their revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie.

Written in July 1919

Published according to
the manuscript

**SPEECH AT A NON-PARTY CONFERENCE
OF WORKERS AND MEN OF THE RED ARMY
AUGUST 6, 1919**

NEWSPAPER REPORT

FIRST VERSION

Lenin's appearance was greeted with an enthusiastic ovation. He said that he would begin with events they had read about in the newspapers of that day and the day before—the events in Hungary.

A Kerensky-type government had dominated Hungary up to the end of March; at that time the members of that government had resigned, realising that they could not hold out; the socialist-conciliators had then sent representatives to the prison in which Comrade Béla Kun, who had at one time served in the ranks of our Red Army, was confined. They had entered into negotiations with him and he went straight from prison into the government.

Information had recently been received to the effect that things were going wrong inside the Socialist Party of Hungary.

Lenin then said that Rumanian troops had entered Budapest but that no particular attention should be paid to that.

"That is what happened in our country," he said, "on the various fronts. But we had sufficient forces in the country to dig ourselves in and then deal Kolchak a proper blow—or to give an answer as we have done on the Petrograd Front. You know that our troops have captured Yamburg.*"

* The old Russian name of Kingisepp.—*Ed.*

Lenin then spoke about the political experience the Soviet Republic had acquired in that period, an experience which the Hungarians, of course, did not possess.

"We shall not," he said, "become downhearted because we know what these temporary triumphs of the Kolchaks and Kornilovs will lead to. Let the Rumanian Kolchaks dance on the bodies of Hungarian workers today, we know that their triumph will be short-lived. It is true that only the steel-like strength of the workers, who give aid to all working people and punish all profiteers, can get us out of this terrible war."

Lenin went on to speak of the actions of the conciliators, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries in Siberia; they were then accusing the Soviet Government of incorrect tactics but could not themselves produce a model of tactics. In reality everything that had happened in Siberia, all the promises that the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries had given had brought nothing but suffering to the peasants as well as the workers. But since the Treaty of Versailles had been signed the workers of France, Britain and other countries were beginning more and more to understand the situation.

For this reason, he said, the recent events in Hungary, burdensome as they were, were similar to what had occurred in the camp of Denikin and Kolchak. The events would open the eyes of hundreds of thousands more workers and would show them that capital was stretching out its hand to recover what it had lost on dishonoured bills.

Lenin then spoke about the conspiracies of the Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries and capitalists to recapture power. "They themselves are plotting, and at the same time they are 'agitating the Soviet Government to renounce terror.

"But we shall not renounce terror because we know that it would only lead to the temporary victory of the Kolchaks and Denikins! Capital is killing itself in the war, and the dying beast is roaring at the workers in its death throes. It cannot, however, prolong its life and it will die!" (*Stormy applause.*)

SECOND VERSION

Lenin said that he would begin with the events they were witnessing in Hungary.

They would remember that until the end of March a Kerensky-type government with all its joys had been dominant. When Soviet power had suddenly been established on March 21—the local Mensheviks incidentally had agreed to support that power—one might have thought that a new era had set in in socialism.... Recent events had shown that the socialist-conciliators had not changed in the least. Apparently what was happening in Hungary was a repetition on a grand scale of what they had recently witnessed in Baku.⁹⁰

Lenin then drew a clear picture of the tragic history of the Baku proletariat; the traitor-socialists had appealed to the British command for help and behind the backs of the workers had entered into a secret agreement with Western imperialists. He drew an analogy between the Baku tragedy and the present revolt in Hungary and spoke of the wireless message that had informed them that the Rumanians had already entered Red Budapest.

Lenin then went on to compare the situation in Hungary with that of Soviet Russia and recalled in brief the temporary Soviet failures; he said that Russia had been saved by her tremendous territory while Hungary was too small to repulse all her enemies. Going over to the question of conciliators in general, Lenin spoke about the Russian socialist parties of conciliators and said:

"If the conciliators of Russia made a mistake under Kerensky that lasted throughout six months of work, why did they not correct that mistake under Kolchak in Siberia?

"The point is that Denikin's crowd are also singing songs about a Constituent Assembly; the counter-revolution does not come out into the open anywhere, so that we can say that temporary failures, like the recent events in Hungary, will not disconcert us. There is no way out of all these misfortunes other than revolution, and there remains only one sure method—the dictatorship of the proletariat. We say that every new defeat of the Red Army only serves to strengthen it, makes it more steadfast and class-conscious, for the workers and peasants have now learned from a sanguinary

experience what to expect from the power of the bourgeoisie and the conciliators. The dying beast of world capital is making its last efforts, but it would nevertheless die!" (*Stormy applause.*)

Published—First version
in *Izvestia* No. 173,
August 7, 1919;
Second version in *Vecherniye*
Izvestia Moskovskogo Soveta
No. 312, August 8, 1919

Published according to
the newspaper texts

TO COMRADES SERRATI AND LAZZARI

Dear Comrades and Friends,

Thanks for the greetings conveyed to us on behalf of your Party. We know very little about your movement; we have no documents whatever. However, the little we do know shows us that we stand together for the Communist International and against the Berne yellow International, which deceives the masses. The negotiations which the leaders of the yellow International conducted with your Party show that they are merely a general staff without an army. The dictatorship of the proletariat and the Soviet system have already won moral victory throughout the world. Real and final victory will inevitably come in all countries of the world, despite all difficulties and all bloodshed, despite the White terror of the bourgeoisie, etc.

Down with capitalism! Down with false democracy, bourgeois democracy! Long live the world republic of Soviets!

Ever yours,

V. Lenin

Moscow, August 19, 1919

Published in Italian
in *Avanti!* No. 243,
September 2, 1919

Published according to
the newspaper text

LETTER TO THE WORKERS AND PEASANTS APROPOS OF THE VICTORY OVER KOLCHAK

Comrades, Red troops have liberated the entire Urals area from Kolchak and have begun the liberation of Siberia. The workers and peasants of the Urals and Siberia are enthusiastically welcoming Soviet power, for it is sweeping away with an iron broom all the landowner and capitalist scum who ground down the people with exactions, humiliations, floggings, and the restoration of tsarist oppression.

Although we all rejoice at the liberation of the Urals and the entry of the Red troops into Siberia we must not allow ourselves to be lulled into a sense of security. The enemy is still far from being destroyed. He has not even been definitely broken.

Every effort must be made to drive Kolchak and the Japanese and other foreign bandits out of Siberia, and an even greater effort is needed to destroy the enemy, to prevent him from starting his banditry again and again.

How is that to be achieved?

The harrowing experience of the Urals and Siberia, as well as the experience of all countries which have been through the torments of the four years of imperialist war, must not be without its lessons for us.

Here are the five chief lessons which all workers and peasants, all working people, must draw from this experience so as to ensure themselves against a repetition of the calamities of the Kolchak rule.

First lesson. In order to defend the power of the workers and peasants from the bandits, that is, from the landowners and capitalists, we need a powerful Red Army. We have proved—not by words but by actual deeds—that we are

capable of creating it, that we have learned to direct it and to defeat the capitalists notwithstanding the lavish assistance in arms and equipment they are receiving from the richest countries in the world. That much the Bolsheviki have proved by actual deeds. All workers and peasants—if they are class-conscious—must place their faith in them, not on the strength of their word (for to believe a man on the strength of his word is foolish), but on the strength of the experience of millions upon millions of people in the Urals and Siberia. It is a most difficult problem to combine two elements—arming the workers and peasants and giving the command to ex-officers, who for the most part sympathise with the landowners and capitalists. It can be solved only given splendid organising ability, strict and conscious discipline, and the confidence of the broad masses in the guiding force, the worker commissars. This most difficult problem the Bolsheviki have solved; cases of treachery on the part of ex-officers are very numerous, nevertheless the Red Army is not only in our hands, but has learned to defeat the generals of the tsar and the generals of Britain, France, and America.

Consequently, everyone who seriously wishes to rid himself of the rule of Kolchak must devote all his energies, means and ability without reservation to the task of building up and strengthening the Red Army. Obey all the laws on the Red Army and all orders conscientiously and scrupulously, support discipline in it in every way, and help the Red Army, each to the best of his ability—such is the prime, fundamental, and principal duty of every class-conscious worker and peasant who does not want the rule of Kolchak.

Fear like the plague the unruly guerrilla spirit, the arbitrary actions of isolated detachments and disobedience to the central authorities, for it spells doom as the Urals, Siberia, and the Ukraine have demonstrated.

He who does not unreservedly and selflessly assist the Red Army, or support order and discipline in it with all his might, is a traitor and treason-monger, a supporter of the rule of Kolchak, and should be shown no mercy.

With a strong Red Army we shall be invincible. Without a strong army we shall inevitably fall victim to Kolchak, Denikin, and Yudenich.

Second lesson. The Red Army cannot be strong without large state stocks of grain, for without them it is impossible to move an army freely or to train it properly. Without them we cannot maintain the workers who are producing for the army.

Every class-conscious worker and peasant must know and remember that the chief reason now that our Red Army successes are not swift and stable enough is precisely the shortage of state stocks of grain. He who does not give his surpluses of grain to the state is helping Kolchak, he is a traitor and betrayer of the workers and peasants and is responsible for the unnecessary death and suffering of tens of thousands of workers and peasants in the Red Army.

Rogues and profiteers and very ignorant peasants argue in this way—better sell my grain at the open market price, I will get far more for it than the fixed price paid by the state.

But the whole point is that free sale promotes profiteering; a few get rich, only the wealthy are sated, while the working masses go hungry. We saw that in practice in the richest grain-bearing districts of Siberia and the Ukraine.

With the free sale of grain capital triumphs, while labour starves and suffers.

With the free sale of grain the price rises to thousands of rubles per pood, money loses its value, a handful of profiteers benefit while the people grow poorer.

With the free sale of grain the government granaries are empty, the army is powerless, industry dies, and the victory of Kolchak and Denikin is inevitable.

Only the rich, only the worst enemies of the workers' and peasants' government are consciously in favour of the free sale of grain. Those who out of ignorance are in favour of the free sale of grain should learn to understand from the example of Siberia and the Ukraine why it means victory for Kolchak and Denikin.

There are still unenlightened peasants who argue as follows: let the state first give me in exchange for my grain good wares at pre-war prices, then I will give up my surplus grain, otherwise I will not. And by this sort of argument the rogues and supporters of the landowners often hoodwink the unenlightened peasants.

It should not be difficult to understand that the workers' state which the capitalists completely devastated by four years of a predatory war for the sake of Constantinople, and which the Kolchaks and Denikins are now devastating again by way of revenge with the help of the capitalists of the whole world—it should not be difficult to understand that such a state cannot at this moment supply the peasants with goods, for industry is at a standstill. There is no food, no fuel, no industry.

Every sensible peasant will agree that the surplus grain must be given to the starving worker as a loan on condition of receiving industrial goods in return.

That is the way it is now. All class-conscious and sensible peasants, all except the rogues and profiteers will agree that *all surplus grain without exception* must be turned over to the workers' state as a loan, because then the state will restore industry and supply industrial goods to the peasants.

But, we may be asked, will the peasants trust the workers' state sufficiently to loan their surplus grain to it?

Our reply is that first, the state gives a bond for the loan in the shape of treasury notes. Secondly, all peasants know by experience that the workers' state, that is, Soviet power, helps the working people and fights the landowners and capitalists. That is why Soviet power is called workers' and peasants' power. Thirdly, the peasants have no other alternative—either they trust the worker or they trust the capitalist; they give their confidence and a loan either to the workers' state or to the capitalist state. There is no other alternative either in Russia or in any country in the world. The more class-conscious the peasants become, the more firmly they stand by the workers and the more resolute they are in their decision to help the workers' state in every way so as to make the return of the power of the landowners and capitalists impossible.

Third lesson. If Kolchak and Denikin are to be completely destroyed the strictest revolutionary order must be maintained, the laws and instructions of the Soviet government must be faithfully observed, and care must be taken that they are obeyed by all.

Kolchak's victories in Siberia and the Urals have been a clear example to all of us that the least disorder, the

slightest infringement of Soviet laws, the slightest laxity or negligence at once serve to strengthen the landowners and capitalists and make for their victory. For the landowners and capitalists have not been destroyed and do not consider themselves vanquished; every intelligent worker and peasant sees, knows, and realises that they have only been beaten and have gone into hiding, are lying low, very often disguising themselves by a "Soviet" "protective" colouring. Many landowners have wormed their way into state farms, and capitalists into various "chief administrations" and "central boards", acting the part of Soviet officials; they are watching every step of the Soviet government, waiting for it to make a mistake or show weakness, so as to overthrow it, to help the Czechoslovaks today and Denikin tomorrow.

Everything must be done to track down these bandits, these landowners and capitalists who are lying low, and to ferret them out, *no matter what guise they take*, to expose them and punish them ruthlessly, for they are the worst foes of the working people, skilful, shrewd, and experienced enemies who are patiently waiting for an opportune moment to set a conspiracy going; they are saboteurs, who stop at no crime to injure Soviet power. We must be merciless towards these enemies of the working people, towards the landowners, capitalists, saboteurs, and counter-revolutionaries.

And in order to be able to catch them we must be skilful, careful, and class-conscious, we must watch out most attentively for the least disorder, for the slightest deviation from the conscientious observance of the laws of the Soviet government. The landowners and capitalists are strong not only because of their knowledge and experience and the assistance they get from the richest countries in the world, but also because of the force of habit and the ignorance of the broad masses who want to live in the "good old way" and do not realise how essential it is that Soviet laws be strictly and conscientiously observed.

The slightest lawlessness, the slightest infraction of Soviet law and order is a *loophole* the foes of the working people take immediate advantage of, it is a *starting-point* for Kolchak and Denikin victories. It would be criminal to forget that the Kolchak movement began through some slight

lack of caution in respect of the Czechoslovaks, with insignificant insubordination on the part of certain regiments.

Fourth lesson. It is criminal to forget not only that the Kolchak movement began with trifles but also that the Mensheviks ("Social-Democrats") and S.R.s ("Socialist-Revolutionaries") assisted its birth and directly supported it. It is time we learned to judge political parties not by their words, but by their deeds.

The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries call themselves socialists, but they are actually *abettors of the counter-revolutionaries*, abettors of the landowners and capitalists. This was proved in practice not only by isolated facts, but by two big periods in the history of the Russian revolution: (1) the Kerensky period, and (2) the Kolchak period. Both times the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, while professing to be "socialists" and "democrats", actually played the role of *abettors of the whiteguards*. Are we then going to be so foolish as to believe them now they are suggesting we let them "try again", and call our permission a "united socialist (or democratic) front"? Since the Kolchak experience, can there still be peasants other than few isolated individuals, who do not realise that a "united front" with the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries means union with the abettors of Kolchak?

It may be objected that the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries have realised their mistake and renounced all alliance with the bourgeoisie. But that is not true. In the first place, the Right Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries have not renounced such an alliance, and there is *no* definite line of demarcation from these "Rights". There is no such line through the fault of the "Left" Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries; for although they verbally "condemn" their "Rights", even the best of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, in spite of all they say, are actually *powerless* compared with them. Secondly, what even the best of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries advocate are actually *Kolchak* ideas which assist the bourgeoisie and Kolchak and Denikin and help to mask their filthy and bloody capitalist deeds. These ideas are: a people's government, universal, equal, and direct suffrage, a constituent assembly, freedom of the press, and the like. All

over the world we see capitalist republics which justify capitalist rule and wars for the enslavement of colonies precisely by this lie of "democracy". In our own country we see that Kolchak, Denikin, Yudenich or any other general readily hands out such "democratic" promises. Can we trust a man who on the strength of verbal promises helps a known bandit? The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, all without exception, help known bandits, the world imperialists, using pseudo-democratic slogans to paint *their* state power, *their* campaign against Russia, *their* rule and *their* policy in bright colours. All the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries offer us an "alliance" on condition that we make concessions to the capitalists and their leaders, Kolchak and Denikin; as, for example, that we "renounce terror" (when we are faced with the terror of the multi-millionaires of the whole Entente, of the whole alliance of the richest countries, that are engineering plots in Russia), or that we open the way for freedom to trade in grain, and so on. What these "conditions" of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries boil down to is this: we, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, are wavering towards the capitalists, and we want a "united front" with the Bolsheviks, against whom the capitalists taking advantage of every concession are fighting! No, my Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary gentlemen, look no more in Russia for people capable of believing you. In Russia class-conscious workers and peasants now realise that the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries are abettors of the whiteguards—some deliberate and malicious, others unwitting and because of their persistence in their old mistakes, but abettors of the whiteguards nevertheless.

Fifth lesson. If Kolchak and his rule are to be destroyed and not allowed to recur, all peasants must unhesitatingly make their choice in favour of the workers' state. Some people (especially the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries—all of them, even the "Lefts" among them) are trying to scare the peasants with the bogey of the "dictatorship of one party", the Party of Bolsheviks, Communists.

The peasants have learned from the Kolchak regime not to be afraid of this bogey.

Either the dictatorship (i.e., the iron rule) of the landowners and capitalists, or the dictatorship of the working class.

There is no middle course. The scions of the aristocracy, intellectualists and petty gentry, badly educated on bad books, dream of a middle course. There is no middle course anywhere in the world, nor can there be. Either the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie (masked by ornate Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik phraseology about a people's government, a constituent assembly, liberties, and the like), or the dictatorship of the proletariat. He who has not learned this from the whole history of the nineteenth century is a hopeless idiot. And we in Russia have all seen how the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries dreamed of a middle course under Kerensky and under Kolchak.

To whom did these dreams do service? Whom did they assist? Kolchak and Denikin. Those who dream of a middle course are abettors of Kolchak.

In the Urals and Siberia the workers and peasants had an opportunity of comparing the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with the dictatorship of the working class. The dictatorship of the working class is being implemented by the Bolshevik Party, the party which as far back as 1905 and even earlier merged with the entire revolutionary proletariat.

Dictatorship of the working class means that the workers' state will unhesitatingly suppress the landowners and capitalists and the renegades and traitors who help these exploiters, and will defeat them.

The workers' state is an implacable enemy of the landowner and capitalist, of the profiteer and swindler, an enemy of the private ownership of land and capital, an enemy of the power of money.

The workers' state is the only loyal friend and helper the working people and the peasantry have. No leaning towards capital but an alliance of the working people to fight it, *workers' and peasants' power, Soviet power*—that is what the "dictatorship of the working class" means *in practice*.

The Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries want to scare the peasants with these words. They won't succeed. After Kolchak, the workers and peasants even in the most

remote backwoods realise that these words mean *precisely that without which there can be no salvation from Kolchak.*

Down with the waverers, with the spineless people who are erring in the direction of helping capital and have been captivated by the slogans and promises of capital! An implacable fight against capital, and an alliance of the working people, an alliance of the peasants and the working class—that is the last and most important lesson of the Kolchak regime.

N. Lenin

August 24, 1919

Pravda No. 190,
August 28, 1919

Published according to
the text of the pamphlet V. I. Lenin,
Letter to the Workers and Peasants
Aprpos of the Victory
over Kolchak, Moscow, 1919

LETTER TO SYLVIA PANKHURST ⁹¹

To Comrade Sylvia Pankhurst, London

Dear Comrade,

August 28, 1919

I received your letter of July 16, 1919, only yesterday. I am extremely grateful to you for the information about Britain and will try to fulfil your request, i.e., reply to your question.

I have no doubt at all that many workers who are among the best, most honest and sincerely revolutionary members of the proletariat are enemies of parliamentarism and of any participation in Parliament. The older capitalist culture and bourgeois democracy in any country, the more understandable this is, since the bourgeoisie in old parliamentary countries has excellently mastered the art of hypocrisy and of fooling the people in a thousand ways, passing off bourgeois parliamentarism as "democracy in general" or as "pure democracy" and so on, cunningly concealing the million threads which bind Parliament to the stock exchange and the capitalists, utilising a venal mercenary press and exercising the power of money, the power of capital in every way.

There is no doubt that the Communist International and the Communist Parties of the various countries would be making an irreparable mistake if they repulsed those workers who stand for Soviet power, but who are against participation in the parliamentary struggle. If we take the problem in its general form, theoretically, then it is this very programme, i.e., the struggle for Soviet power, for the Soviet republic, which is able to unite, and today must certainly unite, all sincere, honest revolutionaries from among the workers. Very many anarchist workers are now becoming

sincere supporters of Soviet power, and that being so, it proves them to be our best comrades and friends, the best of revolutionaries, who have been enemies of Marxism only through misunderstanding, or, more correctly, not through misunderstanding but because the official socialism prevailing in the epoch of the Second International (1889-1914) betrayed Marxism, lapsed into opportunism, perverted Marx's revolutionary teachings in general and his teachings on the lessons of the Paris Commune of 1871 in particular. I have written in detail about this in my book *The State and Revolution* and will therefore not dwell further on the problem.

What if in a certain country those who are Communists by their convictions and their readiness to carry on revolutionary work, sincere partisans of Soviet power (the "Soviet system", as non-Russians sometimes call it), cannot unite owing to disagreement over participation in Parliament?

I should consider such disagreement immaterial at present, since the struggle for Soviet power is the political struggle of the proletariat in its highest, most class-conscious, most revolutionary form. It is better to be with the revolutionary workers when they are mistaken over some partial or secondary question than with the "official" socialists or Social-Democrats, if the latter are not sincere, firm revolutionaries, and are unwilling or unable to conduct revolutionary work among the working masses, but pursue correct tactics in regard to that partial question. And the question of parliamentarism is now a partial, secondary question. Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht were, in my opinion, correct when they defended participation in the elections to the German bourgeois parliament, to the constituent National Assembly, at the January 1919 Conference of the Spartacists in Berlin, *against* the majority at the Conference.⁹² But, of course, they were still more correct when they preferred remaining with the Communist Party, which was making a partial mistake, to siding with the direct traitors to socialism, like Scheidemann and his party, or with those servile souls, doctrinaires, cowards, spineless accomplices of the bourgeoisie, and reformists in practice, such as Kautsky, Haase, Däumig and all this "party" of German "Independents".

I am personally convinced that to renounce participation in the parliamentary elections is a mistake on the part of the revolutionary workers of Britain, but better to make that mistake than to delay the formation of a big workers' Communist Party in Britain out of all the trends and elements, listed by you, which sympathise with Bolshevism and sincerely support the Soviet Republic. If, for example, among the B.S.P.⁹³ there were sincere Bolsheviks who refused, because of differences over participation in Parliament, to merge at once in a Communist Party with trends 4, 6 and 7, then these Bolsheviks, in my opinion, would be making a mistake a thousand times greater than the mistaken refusal to participate in elections to the British bourgeois parliament. In saying this I naturally assume that trends 4, 6 and 7, taken together, are really connected with the *mass* of the workers, and are not *merely* small intellectual groups, as is often the case in Britain. In this respect particular importance probably attaches to the Workers Committees and Shop Stewards,* which, one should imagine, are closely connected with the *masses*.

Unbreakable ties with the mass of the workers, the ability to agitate unceasingly among them, to participate in every strike, to respond to every demand of the masses—this is the chief thing for a Communist Party, especially in such a country as Britain, where until now (as incidentally is the case in all imperialist countries) participation in the socialist movement, and the labour movement generally, has been confined chiefly to a thin top crust of workers, the labour aristocracy, most of whom are thoroughly and hopelessly spoiled by reformism and are held back by bourgeois and imperialist prejudices. Without a struggle against this stratum, without the destruction of every trace of its prestige among the workers, without convincing the masses of the utter bourgeois corruption of this stratum, there can be no question of a serious communist workers' movement. This applies to Britain, France, America and Germany.

Those working-class revolutionaries who make parliamentarism the centre of their attacks are quite right inasmuch as these attacks serve to express their denial in prin-

* These words are in English in the original.—*Ed.*

ciple of bourgeois parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy. Soviet power, the Soviet republic—this is what the workers' revolution has put in place of bourgeois democracy, this is the form of transition from capitalism to socialism, the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. And criticism of parliamentarism is not only legitimate and necessary, as giving the case for the transition to Soviet power, but is quite correct, as being the recognition of the historically conditional and limited character of parliamentarism, its connection with capitalism and capitalism alone, of its progressive character as compared with the Middle Ages, and of *its reactionary character as compared with Soviet power.*

But the critics of parliamentarism in Europe and America, when they are anarchists or anarcho-syndicalists, are very often wrong insofar as they reject *all participation* in elections and parliamentary activity. Here they simply show their lack of revolutionary experience. We Russians, who have lived through two great revolutions in the twentieth century, are well aware what importance parliamentarism can have, and actually does have during a revolutionary period in general and *in the very midst of a revolution* in particular. Bourgeois parliaments must be abolished and replaced by Soviet bodies. 'There is no doubt about that. There is no doubt now, after the experience of Russia, Hungary, Germany and other countries, that this *absolutely must take place* during a proletarian revolution. Therefore, systematically to prepare the working masses for this, to explain to them in advance the importance of Soviet power, to conduct propaganda and agitation for it—all this is the *absolute* duty of the worker who wants to be a revolutionary in deeds. But we Russians fulfilled *that* task, operating in the parliamentary arena, *too*. In the tsarist, fake, landowners' Duma our representatives knew how to carry on revolutionary and republican propaganda. In just the same way *Soviet propaganda* can and *must be carried on* in and from within bourgeois parliaments.

Perhaps that will not be easy to achieve at once in this or that parliamentary country. But that is another question. Steps must be taken to ensure that these correct tactics are mastered by the revolutionary workers in all countries.

And if the workers' party is really *revolutionary*, if it is really a *workers'* party (that is, connected with the masses, with the majority of the working people, with the *rank and file* of the proletariat and not merely with its top crust), if it is really a *party*, i.e., a firmly, effectively knit *organisation of the revolutionary vanguard*, which knows how to carry on revolutionary work among the masses by all possible means, then such a party will surely be able to keep *its own* parliamentarians in hand, to make of them real revolutionary propagandists, such as Karl Liebknecht was, and not opportunists, not those who corrupt the proletariat with bourgeois methods, bourgeois customs, bourgeois ideas or bourgeois poverty of ideas.

If that failed to be achieved in Britain at once, if, in addition, no union of the supporters of Soviet power proved possible in Britain because of a difference over parliamentarism and only because of that, then I should consider a good step forward to complete unity the immediate formation of *two* Communist Parties, i.e., two parties which stand for the transition from bourgeois parliamentarism to Soviet power. Let one of these parties recognise participation in the bourgeois parliament, and the other reject it; this disagreement is now so immaterial that the most reasonable thing would be not to split over it. But even the joint existence of two such parties would be immense progress as compared with the present situation, would most likely be a transition to complete unity and the speedy victory of communism.

Soviet power in Russia has not only shown by the experience of almost two years that the dictatorship of the proletariat is possible *even* in a peasant country and is capable, by creating a strong army (the best proof that organisation and order prevail), of holding out in unbelievably, exceptionally difficult conditions.

Soviet power has done more: it has already achieved a moral victory *throughout* the world, for the working masses everywhere, although they get only tiny fragments of the truth about Soviet power, although they hear thousands and millions of false reports about Soviet power, *are already in favour of Soviet power*. It is already understood by the proletariat of the whole world that this power is the power of the working people, that it alone is salvation from capitalism,

from the yoke of capital, from wars between the imperialists, that it leads to lasting peace.

That is why defeats of individual Soviet republics by the imperialists are possible, but it is impossible to conquer the world Soviet movement of the proletariat.

With communist greetings,

N. Lenin

P.S.—The following cutting from the Russian press will give you an example of our information about Britain:

"London, 25.8 (via Beloostrov). The London correspondent of the Copenhagen paper *Berlingske Tidende* wires on August 3rd concerning the Bolshevik movement in Britain: 'The strikes which have occurred in the last few days and the recent revelations have shaken the confidence of the British in the immunity of their country to Bolshevism. At present the press is vigorously discussing this question, and the government is making every effort to establish that a "conspiracy" has existed for quite a long time and has had for its aim neither more nor less than the overthrow of the existing system. The British police have arrested a revolutionary bureau which, according to the press, had both money and arms at its disposal. *The Times* publishes the contents of certain documents found on the arrested men. They contain a complete revolutionary programme, according to which the entire bourgeoisie are to be disarmed; arms and ammunition are to be obtained for Soviets of Workers' and Red Army Deputies and a Red Army formed; all government posts are to be filled by workers. Furthermore, it was planned to set up a revolutionary tribunal for political criminals and persons guilty of cruelly treating prisoners. All foodstuffs were to be confiscated. Parliament and other organs of public government were to be dissolved and revolutionary Soviets created in their place. The working day was to be lowered to six hours and the minimum weekly wage raised to £7. All state and other debts were to be annulled. All banks, industrial and commercial enterprises and means of transport were to be declared nationalised.'"

If this is true, then I must offer the British imperialists and capitalists, in the shape of their organ, the richest newspaper in the world, *The Times*, my respectful gratitude and thanks for their excellent propaganda in behalf of Bolshevism. Carry on in the same spirit, gentlemen of *The Times*, you are splendidly leading Britain to the victory of Bolshevism!

FREEDOM TO TRADE IN GRAIN

THE BASIC CONDITION FOR VICTORY

How are we to consolidate our victory over Kolchak? How to complete it by destroying Denikin? How to make it impossible for the landowners, capitalists and kulaks to make any further attempts to regain their power, their land, their capital and their rule over the workers and peasants?

These are the questions that are actually identical with the question of the fate of the socialist revolution in Russia. Every politically-conscious worker and peasant has given some thought to this question, and it is not difficult to come to the conclusion that the food question now lies at the bottom of all socialist development.

Collecting all grain surpluses in the hands of the Soviet central authorities and correctly distributing them means making our Red Army invincible, it means the final rout of Kolchak and Denikin, it means the rehabilitation of industry and guarantees proper socialist production and distribution, guarantees the complete victory of the socialist system.

We now have enough experience of food supply work and socialist organisation to get a clear picture of its dimensions and the means of doing it. We know all the difficulties involved, we also know from experience that we have found the right way to surmount them and that by concentrating on this task, by applying greater energy, by mustering our forces and improving the apparatus we *can* solve this problem in its entirety.

Between August 1, 1917 and August 1, 1918, the state procured 30 million poods of grain. Between August 1, 1918 and

August 1, 1919, we procured about 105 million poods, i.e., three and a half times more, although in this latter period we did not have the Don region, the North Caucasus and Western Siberia, and had a very small part of the Ukraine—we did not have the main grain-growing regions.

With a good harvest in 1919 we shall be able to procure very much grain, perhaps 400 million poods or more. Then we shall increase tremendously our output of fuel, timber, coal, etc. Then we shall restore industry and take the broad road of planned socialist development, firmly and irrevocably. Then we shall completely defeat profiteering and shall destroy this disgusting survival of capitalism that is today everywhere damaging the young beginnings of socialism.

THE TRUE ROAD TO VICTORY

The figures given above show that Soviet power has achieved important successes in matters of food; these successes have been achieved in conditions of unprecedented, unheard-of difficulty. Even the clearest figures and the most indisputable facts are either challenged or passed over in silence when it comes to defending the selfish interests of the bourgeoisie, capitalists, profiteers and kulaks.

An exact study of the food situation of the urban worker shows that he obtains only a half (approximately) of his food from the state, from the Commissariat of Food, and the other half he buys in the "free", "open" market, i.e., from the profiteers. Furthermore, for the first half he pays only *one-tenth* of the total amount spent on food and for the second half he pays the other *nine-tenths*.

The profiteers skin the hungry worker nine times over.

The profiteers plunder him unbelievably. We all know that an orgy of profit-making, robbery and crime, that the torments of hunger for the masses of the workers and the enrichment of a few scoundrels are connected with this notorious "*freedom to trade*" in grain.

Notwithstanding this there are people who advocate freedom to trade!

Our workers' and peasants' government, the entire Soviet Republic, all the socialist society of ours now being born, are in a state of war, a brutal, desperate, savage war for

survival against capitalism, against profiteering, against freedom to trade in grain. This is the most profound, most radical, daily and truly mass struggle between capitalism and socialism. The fate of our revolution as a whole depends on the outcome of this struggle. But people who call themselves "socialists", Social-Democrats, Mensheviks, "Socialist-Revolutionaries" are helping capitalism in this struggle against socialism! Even the best of these people, those most hostile to Kolchak, Denikin and the *capitalists*, go over to the side of *capitalism* when it comes to the question of the food policy of Soviet power, and demand minor concessions in favour of the "private commercial apparatus", "individual enterprise" and so on, and so forth.

If you study this carefully, if you think deeply about why, actually, there is a struggle against Soviet power, you come to the conclusion that the enemies of Soviet power may be divided into two big groups both of which defend capitalism against socialism. One of them acts brutally and with the crudest selfishness; this is the group of landowners, capitalists, kulaks, Denikins, Kolchaks, Black Hundreds and Constitutional-Democrats. The other group defends capitalism "ideologically", that is, unselfishly, without any direct, personal profit, but out of prejudice and cowardice in face of the new; this is the group of Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. These are the last "ideological" advocates of capitalism. And it was by no means an accident that the Kolchaks and Denikins, the Russian and all foreign capitalists march under cover of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, behind *their* banner, behind *their* flag, and repeat *their* slogans and phrases about "freedom" in general, about "democracy" in general, about "private" (commercial, capitalist) enterprise, etc., etc.

Clever capitalists realise that the "ideological" position of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries is of service to them, to their class, to "*their*" capitalism, but the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, like all petty-bourgeois socialists everywhere and at all times, do not realise this. They fear a life-and-death struggle against freedom to trade in grain, they want to make concessions to it, to recognise it at least in part, to be in "peace" and agreement with it.

WHAT IS FREEDOM TO TRADE IN GRAIN?

Freedom to trade in grain is a return to capitalism, to the full power of the landowners and capitalists, to a savage struggle between people for profit, to the "free" enrichment of the few, to the poverty of the masses, to the eternal bondage we see in all bourgeois states, including the freest and most democratic republics.

If we ask any person who works for his living, any factory worker, peasant or even intellectual, whether he wants such a "system" he will certainly say "no". The whole trouble and the whole danger is that a very large number of working people, especially a large number of peasants, *do not realise* that freedom to trade in grain is connected with the universal power of the landowners and capitalists.

Written in August 1919

Published according to
the manuscript
